RAMMANOHAR LOHIA

A BIOGRAPHY OF HIS VISION AND IDEAS

RAMMANOHAR LOHIA

A BIOGRAPHY OF HIS VISION AND IDEAS

Edited by
VERINDER GROVER
Former Reader, Department of Political Science,
and Managing Editor, Indian Political Science Review,
University of Delhi, Delhi

DEEP & DEEP PUBLICATIONS
F-159, Rajouri Garden, New Delhi-110027

RAMMANOHAR LOHIA
(Political Thinkers of Modern India)

VERINDER GROVER

1998

Typeset by Ashish Technographics, 3190, Mohindra Park,
Shakur Basti, Delhi-110034.

Printed in India at Elegant Printers, A 38/2, Mayapuri, Phase I,
New Delhi-110064

Published by DEEP & DEEP PUBLICATIONS, F-159, Rajouri Garden,
New Delhi-110027. Phones : 5435369, 5440916

CONTENTS

Preface xi

PART-I

1. *Rammanohar Lohia*
Is It Recovery ? 3

2. *Rammanohar Lohia*
The Struggle for Civil Liberties 9

3. *Rammanohar Lohia*
India's Stand 47

4. *Rammanohar Lohia*
The Mystery of Sir Stafford Cripps 62

5. *Rammanohar Lohia*
India on China 89

6. *Rammanohar Lohia*
Indians in Foreign Lands 111

7. *Rammanohar Lohia*
The Doctrinal Foundation of Socialism 141

8. *Rammanohar Lohia*
Marxism and Socialism 180

9. *Rammanohar Lohia*
Socialist Self-Criticism 205

10. *Rammanohar Lohia*
Statement of Principles 210

11. *Rammanohar Lohia*
India's Path to Socialism 228

12. *Rammanohar Lohia*
The Meaning of Equality 244

13. *Rammanohar Lohia*
Foreign Policy 262

14. *Rammanohar Lohia*
The Seven Revolutions and Five Hidden Imperialisms 269

15. *Rammanohar Lohia*
On Inequality of Sexes, Single Woman and Widow 282

16. *Rammanohar Lohia*
Hindu Versus Hindu 293

17. *Rammanohar Lohia*
A Philosophy of Despair 305

18. *Rammanohar Lohia*
The Four-Pillar State 315

19. *Rammanohar Lohia*
Programme to End Poverty 335

20. *Rammanohar Lohia*
Where the Mind is Without Fear 341

21. *Rammanohar Lohia*
India's Armed Forces 351

22. *Rammanohar Lohia*
My Restlessness and the Reasons for It 381

23. *Rammanohar Lohia*
Hindi—Here and Now 384

24. *Rammanohar Lohia*
Russia's Developments 396

25. *Rammanohar Lohia*
Presidential Election 405

26. *Rammanohar Lohia*
Anecdotes About Mahatma Gandhi 413

27. *Rammanohar Lohia*
Gandhi's Blemish 440

28. *Rammanohar Lohia*
Naxalbari, Asansol and Calcutta 445

29. *Rammanohar Lohia*
Plea for a Budget Without Foreign Aid 464

30. *Rammanohar Lohia*
Equality and Prosperity 473

31. *Rammanohar Lohia*
The Civil Disobedience Movement, 1960 482

32. *Rammanohar Lohia*
Some Selected Questions and Answers 491

PART II

33. *Om Prakash Deepak*
Development of Lohia's Thoughts 511

34. *Chandradev Prasad*
Lohia and the Origins of Indian Foreign Policy 519

35. *Harris Wofforo Jr.*
Lohia's Address at the Fisk University
Negro School in the South 521

36. *Clovis Maksud*
Lohia 534

37. *Parimal Kumar Das*
Non-Congressism and the Strategy of Revolution 537

38. *Tulsi Boda*
Dr. Lohia : Angrezi Hatao 544

39. *H.V. Kamath*
Lohia in the Lok Sabha 548

40. *Brij Mohan Toofan*
Lohia and the Indian Youth 551

41. *Jagdish Joshi*
Marx and Lohia : The Socialist Path 556

42. *Birendra Kumar Bhattacharya*
Gandhi, Lohia and Gandhism 561

43. *Rohit Dave*
Humane Socialism of Dr. Lohia 571

44. *Prem Bhasin*
Dr. Lohia and Asian Socialism 576

45. *Madhu Dandavate*
Lohia's Quest for a New Dimension 584

46. *Usha Mehta*
Marx, Gandhi and Lohia 589

47. *Raghuvansh*
Dr. Lohia and Gandhi's Legacy 596

48. *A. Vasudevan*
Lohia's Ideas on Indian Economic Development 604

49. *Bhola Chatterji*
Rammanohar Lohia : The Man of Upright Life 608

50. *Ian MacMohan*
Lohia—An American Radical's Estimate 612

51. *K.G. Ramakrishnan*
Mystery of Rammanohar Lohia 630

52. *Divakar Sakrikar*
Foreign Policy : Dr. Lohia's Thought 641

53. *Harris Wofford Jr.*
One Gets so Lonely 648

54. *Rajinder Puri*
Without Lohia 656

55. *P.C. Shastri*
Lohia's Foreign Policy Attitudes 661

56. *C.N. Chitta Ranjan*
Lohia : Quicksand Revolutionary 668

57. *Verinder Grover*
Lohia : The Unique Socialist 675

Bibliography 679

Index 687

PREFACE

Dr. Rammanohar Lohia is one of the great leaders of modern India. He was born on 23rd March 1910 at Akbarpur in Faizabad District (U.P.) in a *Vaish* family, which acquired the surname of 'Lohia' for its dealing in the business of *Loha* (Hardware) for many generations. From his father, Hiralal, Lohia, inherited the feelings of nationalism, love and affection towards the poor and needy and also indifference towards crude customs and superstitions. The environment in which young Lohia spent his childhood was free from caste prejudice. Even as a child, Lohia took interest in helping the poor, the needy and the downtrodden and defended the weak when they were attacked.

Lohia completed his primary education at Akbarpur; passed Matriculation in 1925 from Marwari Vidyalaya, Bombay; Intermediate in 1927 from the Kashi Vishwavidyalaya, Banaras, and B.A. in 1929 from Vidyasagar College, Calcutta. From the very early age Lohia took active part in public life. In 1920 on the death of Lokmanya Tilak, Lohia at the age of 10 years, took the initiative in organizing a strike in the school. His major passion was to liberate India from the foreign yoke. He, therefore, became a freedom fighter at a very early age and played a magnificent role in giving direction and ideological content to the 1942 Movement.

After the achievement of Independence Lohia remained an active participant and an organizer of many movements which he thought were beneficial for the country.

Dr. Rammanohar Lohia's contribution to the Socialist movement was outstanding. His socialism was fundamentally different from most of the socialist theories in India, which advocated either the western or the Soviet models of socialism to be adopted for this country. His socialism was a product of the

soil. He borrowed freely from the western as well as the Soviet models of socialism and adjusted these to suit his new brand of socialism for the Indian way of life. He discarded many of the outdated concepts of Hegel, Marx and Lenin, because he realised that the Indian masses needed a simple and understandable form of socialism. As such the Lohian brand of socialism was so simple that even an illiterate labourer or farmer could understand its meaning without any mental strain.

Dr. Lohia was greatly influenced by Gandhi, but was not a slavish follower of the Mahatma. He wanted the implementation of the principle of decentralisation in all aspects, but rejected the Gandhian concept that at the technical level India's ills can be solved by the use of *Charkha*. He was in favour of innovative technology for fields as well as workshops. He admired the non-violent resistance forged by Gandhi and rejected armed revolution which differentiated him from other radicals.

The critics of Dr. Lohia have denounced his socialism as imaginary and unfit for India and accuse him of confused mind who is bent upon creating chaos in the country. But it looks that this criticism is uncharitable and the critics have failed to look into the true spirit of Lohia's ideas.

The book is divided into two parts. Part I deals with the articles, speeches and works of Rammanohar Lohia and Part II consists of articles by scholars assessing the contribution of Dr. Lohia.

This book is a systematic piecing together of articles contributed by scholars and specialists to the various journals of national and international repute. My special thanks are due to the *Janata*, *Mankind*, *Indian Journal of Political Science*, *India Quarterly*, *Political Science Review*, *Seminar*, *AICC Economic Review*, *Commerce*, *Harijan*, *Link*, *Mainstream* and the *Weekend Review* from which I have drawn freely. I express my deep sense of appreciation to all the contributors for their scholarly papers and gratitude to the various librarians and eminent scholars in the field who extended their co-operation to me.

New Delhi VERINDER GROVER

PART I

1

IS IT RECOVERY ?

RAMMANOHAR LOHIA

What are the prospects for the capitalist world in 1936 ? Many economists claim that the world is out of depression and is well on the road to Recovery. There are some, sober in their optimism, who admit that the prosperity, by its very nature, is cyclic. The vision of "prosperity everlasting" has not been as yet resuscitated. The economic facts of the last few years lend some basis to this contention of the economists. There has been some increase in the production of the means of production a certain rise in prices, some absorption of accumulated stocks of commodities some increase in profits and investments.

The production indices have gone up, compared to the rock-bottom point reached by them in the grim days of 1932.

1925—28	100
1929	110
1932	69
1933	78
1934	84
1935	90.

The Agrarian crisis, in the Western countries atleast, has become less acute. The restrictive measures have scaled down harvests and have restored profitibility to an extent. The improvement in other departments of economy is due, to some extent, to

the resiliency inherent in capitalism. Capitalism can always restore a temporary stability. The bourgeoisie have, by cutting down or destroying "surplus" production restored profitibility. The rewards to the workers and the producers of raw materials have been scaled down. Profitibility, under capitalist decline, is gained by aggravating poverty and want of the masses. Capitalism has restored its equilibrium—tho on a lower level—will the equilibrium last ? Will the spiral go up or down ?

One of the principal fillip to the recovery has come from the armament expenditure. The manufacture of armaments creates market for the heavy industries and thereby releases the forces of production in that sector of capitalist economy where it has shrunk the greatest and which can impart a fillip to all other sectors of economy once it gets going. The present recovery, to no small extent, owes its origin to the "war boom." The effect on economic developments of the war factor can be gauged from the tremendous increase in the war expenditure of the capitalist countries of the world. The expenditure has gone up from 15 billion marks in 1929 to about 30 billion marks in 1935—a cent per cent, increase in six years ! The depression has proved a boon to armament industries, and it was in the nature of things. A collapsing economy sought autarchy, sought means of spending money, to ward off the dangers of increasing unemployment. But this was to be done without creating inconvenient increase in production which would further peopardise the dwindling profits. What better way was out of this dilemma, than spending money on "strengthening one's defenses " And the pangs of depression were sought to be softened by rousing the jingo feeling and the armament lords capitalised the mood by making further claims on the wealth of the people.

The economic life of Japan, Germany and Italy has been absolutely bound up with the war preparations. The whole economy has been "co-ordinated" for the purposes of war As Palme Dutt has pointed out in his classic : *Fascism and Social Revolution*, this time the economy has been subordinated to the interests of war *before* the war has started. In the last war this subordination was achieved long after the war was declared this time the 'economic mobilisation" has been achieved in peace times. Economic mobilisation is, as we shall see, at once the aggravator and mitigator of economic maladjustment. This paradox is merely another example of the ineluctable contradictions with which capitalism is

riddled.

Germany, since the advent of Hitler, has been spending lavishly on war preparations. Armaments have been increased with feverish haste, military roads, a huge air armada, a new navy, a re-equipped army have been created by piling up huge debt and scaling down the standard of living of the workers. As a publicist observes, "Having squandered her foreign exchange reserves on the acquisition of raw materials for the war industries, having increased her indebtendness to the steep figure of 38 billion marks, having deprived the population of fat and other staple food-stuffs, Hitlers Germany in 1935 continued to 'bolster up' the country's economy by 'public work,' war order and subsidies to financial magnates."

The Japanese economic life is thoroughly subordinated to the war needs of the nation. More than 60 p c. of her Budget is devoted to the military departments. "The persistence shown by military circles in their ever-growing demands and in the struggle that they wage for every extra million yen becomes comprehensible," writes a Russian authority in *Prvada*, "only if we realize that the war budget is not only one of the most important sources of money for the technical equipment of the army but also a means of preparing Japanese home industry for some future large-scale struggle . . . Japanese military circles tackled the problem of eliminating the disparity between the war materials industry of the country and the demands, both present and future, of a modern army . . . During 1933-35, 777 million yen from war budget were paid out to civilian industries in a large number of war orders . . . . Obviously, these sums in the hands of the War Ministry are not only a powerful lever for the regulation of the war time organisation of Japanese industry but also a strong means of directing capital investment into war-like channels . . . The profits shown by industries loaded with war orders are extraordinary, e.g., 46 per cent is the average profit of the chemical factories of the Toyo Rayen group." Japan has been at war since 1930, and that has greatly facilitated her task of the economic mobilisation, tho, *pari passu*, the tension too has been increasing.

Even in England, the recovery is due to the war preparations, this is amply proved by the great rise in the shares of the munition firms and the increased activities of the Imperial Chemicals, Vickers, aviation industry, naval shipyards and the rayon industry.

"A few years ago. Vickers split up its stock and wrote down," observes the *Living Age*, "its value from 20 sh. a share to 6sh. 8d. Today this stock fetches 19 sh. a share. During the first nine months of 1935, the price of Skoda munitions shares rose by 70 per cent, and the profits of British Celanese, which manufactures chemical products, increased by the same amount during the first quarter of 1935." To keep up the recovery the Baldwin Government after capturing pacifist votes has decided to arm Britain to teeth financing the war-plans to the tune of £ 200,000,000.

The Abyssinian war has greatly helped towards the dimunition of the accumulated stocks and thus thawing the almost frozen demands. This increased activity has naturally sent up prices.

	Oct. 1934	*Nov. 1935*
Copper	100	130
Lead	100	160
Zinc	100	150

The recovery in the capitalist countries is thus mainly based on war-demands. It is created and maintained, mostly, by the war demands. Is such a recovery stable ?

There are many unfavourable forces still active to upset the precarious equilibrium. The equilibrium based upon and brought about mainly by the war needs is open to the new disturbing forces that these war needs themselves unleash. The recovery based as it is mostly on unnatural forces has a precarious position.

To fight depression, greater attention was given to internal economy, the drive towards *autarchy* generated by military needs, has become more pronounced. This has adversely affected the international trade and greatly decreased international lending. These life breaths of capitalism are well nigh strangled—and an atmosphere tense with was is not the right atmosphere to cajole forth international lending, nor increase international trade. The industrial economy, especially under its present uneven and lop-sided development is essentially inter-national in character. By inscribing it within the corners of *autarchy* its productivity is greatly decreased. Autarchy demands protection, and protection lowers consuming power of the masses, and thus arise fresh demands for subsidies. The vicious spiral thus goes on. Autarchic protection has not the saving grace of being

"nurturing."

The autarchic development of capitalist economy is responsible for the un-evenness in the indices of industrial production throught the world.

(1920=100)

Country	*1932*	*1933*	*1934*	*1935*
Japan	92	109	128	143
Sweden	73	77	102	109
U.K.	84	86	99	105
Germany	53	60	80	94
U.S.A.	50	76	70	72
Netherlands	58	67	69	69
France	67	80	71	67
Czechoslovakia	63	60	69	66
Poland	55	58	62	64

Note : [Compare with these figures the record of uninterrupted socialist construction in the U.S.S.R.

	173	202	245	283]

Thus, while in some countries the pre-crisis level has been reached and passed in most of the countries, especially in those still adhering to the gold standard, the improvement is next to nil. This unevenness, as the Economic Report of the League of Nations, from which the above statistics are quoted, points out, increases the danger of the upsetting of the still unstable balance.

The crisis and the "cures" resorted to, to break it have almost dislocated and disintegrated the international trade. The last year has not appreciably opened the sluices of international commerce. In 1935, the world trade was below the 1929 level by no less than 67.4 per cent.

The very measures resorted to restore prosperity have put fresh hurdles in the way of the return of prosperity, measures unconceived before have been evolved by ingenuity of men, such as the blocked currency, the exchange control, quota restrictions, etc., To save its share in a collapsing market every nation has resorted to measures which have, in their turn, further abridged the market.

The exchange control was tried to be evaded by resorting to currency devaluation and the effects of devaluation were tried to

be negatived by tightening exchange control. Devaluation helps merchants, particularly, exporters, while it hits producers and *rentiers*. Devaluation has been the result of play of various economic "pulls" on the government (best examplified in the U.S.A.) and devaluation calling for the retaliatory measures from the nations hit by the manouevre.

"World economy is in a vicious circle. This vicious circle has narrowed down to such a point that it is now difficult to say whether the commercial restrictions are responsible for instability of currencies or whether the instability of the currrencies in forcing a system of autarchy and new measures of commercial-political defence.

Currency stabilization would go some way towards ensuring recovery, but because of the general instability no power is prepared to discuss it. England, the leader of sterling *bloc* refuses even to discuss stabilization, unstable economic conditions prevent stabalization of currencies, and instability of currencies continue, and often separate economic *malaise*. Capitalism is enmeshed in its own contradictions.

Another measure very popular with the capitalist recovery-hunters is *rationalisation*. In order to restore profits (that is to find avenues of investment for the accumulated profits) the production is made more round about, the lien of the capitalist on production—product of labour—is increased and the reward of workers—variable capital—is diminished. Rationalisation attacks the standard of living of the workers *en mass* by augmenting unemployment tho it might the wages of some privileged groups of workers.

Inspite of the leeway made towards recovery in the last few years unemployment has not decreased appreciably. At the end of 1935, there were more than 25,000,000 unemployed in the world. "*It is a disconcerting fact that after almost two years of recovery in many countries world unemployment was still more than twice as great as in* 1929" ("World Economic Survey" 1935).

2

THE STRUGGLE FOR CIVIL LIBERTIES

RAMMANOHAR LOHIA

CIVIL LIBERTIES IN FRANCE

"The League was born out of a revolt of conscience against the will fanatically to maintain an illegal and unjust condemnation. It was founded with the object to defend, against the spirit of caste and race and reasons of State, all survivals of a remote past, the Rights of Man as affirmed by the French Revolution." So begins a resolution of the 1895 Congress of the French League of Rights of Man.

Dreyfus is a household word in France. It is almost a synonym of the tyranny of a ruling caste and the vain and futile prejudices on which such tyranny rests. It awakens men to the dangers and the horror of a judiciary that is associated with the ruling caste. At the same time, it is a by-word for the dogged determination of the people to fight against tyranny and injustice. No matter if miscarriage of justice is of repeated. Dreyfus is the word that denotes final victory of injustice through persistence and continued effort.

Dreyfus was a Jew and an officer in the French Army. A very capable man, he succeeded in arousing the ire of the caste that considered the army its preserve. Important army secrets were leaking out to Germany and the responsibility was naturally fastened on Dreyfus. Dreyfus was dishonoured, sentenced to hard labour and transported to the Devils Isle. Time after time, true facts were brought before the courts, which were none too pleasant

for the army aristocracy, but reasons of State and the prestige of the French army decided the verdict against Dreyfus. The conscience of the French nation was convulsed and Emile Zola made a spirited attack on the culpability of the Courts. Twelve years of persistent effort, 1894-1906, succeeded in the rehabilitation of Dreyfus.

In 1898, the League of Rights of Man was founded. Men had harboured the fond illusion that, with the end of the Dreyfus case, ignorance and prejudice and miscarriage of justice had been finally overcome. The League has since had to defend several cases against persecution of opinion, illegal detention, arbitrary action of the Government, tyrannous laws and such other attacks upon the Rights of Man.

The League has to-day a membership of over 160,000 which is spread over a territory of 96 departmental federations and 2,490 sections. Each section has its own executive and the right to convene conferences and public and private meetings. It may intervene on behalf of victims of injustice and arbitrary action and report to the higher Committees for the organisation of national agitation on certain issues. The League meets once a year in an annual Congress reports on the work done, elects a central Executive and raises issues of changes in existing laws or of their maladministration. It is not difficult to imagine the extent to which the League, with its large membership and marvellous territorial reach, has become a part of French national life.

The more important of the Statutes of the League are :

1. A French Association to defend the principles of Liberty, Equality and Justice laid down in the "Declarations of the Rights of Man" of 1789 and 1973.
2. The League intervenes on every occasion where an injustice, an arbitary act, an abuse of power or an illegality is done against the individual, the associations and the peoples." Its action consists in appeal to public conscience, presentations to public authorities, petitions to Parliament, publication of literature, conferences and demonstrations.
3. No member of the Central Committee can assume Governmental functions.
4. An annual subscription of 10 Francs is levied on each member.

The concept of civil rights in any clear form arose first out of the French Revolution. In their fight against the Bastille where countless men were made to suffer and die without law, except an order of the Government, the French gave to the world a concept of what no Government dare do to its citizens and what is the right of every man. "Men are born and live free and equal before law." "The aim of all political association (the State) is the conservation of natural rights are liberty, property, security and resistance to oppression"; "Sovereignty resides in the nation. No group or individual dare exercise authority which does not emanate expressly from the nation"; "Law is an expression of general ill. All citizens are equally admissible to public employment and dignities"; "No man may be accased, arrested or detained out of the scope of the law and the prescribed forms"; "The free communication of ideas and opinion is a very precious right of man"; are a few of the articles laid down by the French Constitution of 1789. This statement of human rights is among the first points of departure for modern civilisation in the regulation of relations between the citizen and the Government. The French League through its incessant and numerous activities, attempts to pattern real life on the ideal and also, to chisel the ideal brighter and clearer.

What this ideal is like, is evidenced in an extract from a speech Monsieur Guerent, an ex-General Secretary, made in Rumània in 1925 :

> "It is said that Mr. Caillaux, while the war was on, wanted a piece of compromise. That is bad, but, then, it is his right to say so".
>
> "It is said that M. Caillaux, even during the war, wanted to change the Constitution. That is bad, but it is his right."

"It is said that M. Caillaux believed that peace was possible in 1917. Perhaps an absurd idea, but that is his right." Monsieur Caillaux, who had to suffer a preventive detention of 27 months, is one of those whom the Civil Libert'es Unions of the World seize upon as an "affair" around which to rouse a terrific campaign against executive encroachment on human rights.

Before, however, we fully understand the League's concept of civil rights, let us examine how it seeks to adapt judicial and

executive action to its principles. In order that justice is done from day to day to individual sufferers, the League makes representations on their behalf. So, during the fortnight ending on 24th September, 1936, the numerous Sections and Federations of the League intervened for about 50 individual cases win either the Minister of Justice, of Public Health, of Education or of Interior. Authentic information on each individual case is collected and documented dossiers prepared. The League and its Sections, also, pronounce their judgment on cases involving breach of civil rights in the form of resolutions and national campaign is sometimes organised. The sympathetic section of the daily press and journals, to whom communiques are furnished, assist the League in agitating public opinion in the necessary direction. The League itself issues a fortnightly periodical "Les Cahiers Des Droits-De L'Homme", (Sheets of the Rights of Man), which surveys it work, resolutions and conferences and is generally educative on human rights. It publishes and distributes a large number of brochures of informations and education and tracts, such as, "The Dreyfus Affair", "Democracy and War", "The Present Duty of the League", "Problems of Nationalities", "Colonel Picart in Prison", "Declarations of Rights of Man and of Citizens", "Fascism in Italy". Further, the League seeks to touch public conscience by organising mass meetings as also educative conferences. The mass meetings dramatise certain broad ideas and the educative conferences are designed for a deeper and more detailed impression. Vigilance, publicity and doggedness seem to be the League's eminent qualities.

The League does not confine its attention to France but is vigilant on the suppression of civil rights in the colonies and of other peoples. Monsieur Moutet, the present Secretary of State for Colonies, is a member of the League. In the course of a letter to the President of the League recounting his achievements during two months, Moutet says, "Since the advent to power of the new Government, the dossiers of 1871, political prisoners in Indo-China have been examined. For over 68 per cent of these, for 1277, interventions (mostly unconditional release) have been effected." In like manner the League carries on agitation for sufferers in other countries, particularly those under Fascist Regime.

The French League has rolled on from milestone to milestone on the road towards greater human dignity. Its tasks are not

confined to the defence of human rights against the overt attacks of laws of sedition, of press, of restrictions on freedom of association and those of arbitary executive action or of miscarriage of justice. Its concept of civil rights is wider. The League seeks also to fight all ultimate sources of mischief and to provide all citizens with a solid base from where they may ward off attacks on their rights. Democracy and peace are, therefore, essential items in the League's propaganda; the former to safeguard and extend the sovereignty of the people and the latter to secure its unbroken enjoyment. In the absence of democracy, the League rightly fears, human liberties stand in danger of being engulfed by dictatorial authority.

In a message of greetings to the Deputies of the People's Front, the League defines its task as the defence of democratic liberties conquered by the people, provision of bread to workers and labour to youth and the conferment of the grand human peace on the world. The League reminds the Deputies of their pledge that they will abolish the infamous laws of restrictions of public opinion and work for the liberty of conscience and encouragement of non-denominational public schools. They will ensure the liberty of the working class to organise and to strike. They will seek to deliver the State and the organs of information of the democracy, press, etc. from the tyranny of money and financial oligarchies. They will effect an increase in the people's purchasing power, notionalise the Bank of France and the Arms Industry and take the world from armed peace to peace without arms. Further, the League draws the attention of the Deputies to its own demands for curtailment of the powers of the judiciary and police and the grant of freedom to the colonial peoples and the extension of franchise to women.

In the words of an ex-President, Ferdinand Buisson, the League is an advocate of the Little Man, of the working class of the colonial peoples and oppressed nationalities and the organiser of public conscience.

The League today makes an approach to public conscience not merely on the judicial plane but also on the political. It is no mere revolt against miscarriage of justice or the existing penal laws but a positive defence of democracy and republicanism. The League does not directly participate in the elections but devotes itself to delineating the grand directions in which public authority,

Government and Parliament alike, should engage itself.

An ex-General Secretary of the League once proclaimed that the League shall continue till "the last knot of the last chain of the last slave" is broken asunder. Its President declares, "We are the vanguard of the Republic, the defence of democracy."

No greater tribute could be paid to the oldest of the Civil Rights Leagues in the world than that its President, Monsieur Victor Basch, is also the President of the People's Front, the power behind the Blum Government.

CIVIL LIBERTIES IN AMERICA

In the theoretical justification of extensive civil liberties and, in particular, of the rights of the citizen in opposition to the Government, the United States of America easily holds the palm in the world. The unlimited moral and legal freedom of the individual to express by speech, if he so chooses his revolt against existing social order and the Government has met with an open-hearted and an unhedged assent. Thomas Jefferson, Patrick Henry, Benjamin Franklin and Abraham Lincoln, in pre-war times, ex-Governor Smith, Senator Borah and Justice Holmes, in recent years, to select only a few, have freedom of opposition to the Government. Defending the 'field of opinion' against the magistracy, Thomas Jefferson declared in 1786 that it was time enough for the government 'to interfere when principles break out into overt acts against peace and good order.' A little earlier, Patrick Henry had advised the people to 'guard with zealous attention the public liberty' and to 'suspect everyone who approaches that jewel.' Admitting that abuses of freedom of speech ought to be suppressed, Benjamin Franklin retorted, 'to whom dare we commit the power of doing it.' Whenever the people shall grow weary of the existing goverment, said Abraham Lincoln in 1861, they can exercise their constitutional rights of amending it, or their revolutionary right of over-throwing it.' The United States Commission on Industrial Relations reported in 1914 that a government which could be maintained only by the suppression of criticism should not be maintained. Ex-Governor Smith of New York while pardoning prisoner Larkin in 1923, thought that 'an imprisonment of five years for the mere expression of an erroneous, or even an illegal, political doctrine unaccompanied by and overt act' was

not at all required. Senator Borah said a year ago, "Repression is not only the enemy of free government, but it is the breeder of revolutions. It is the enemy of progress and human happiness. And above all, it is neither a test of error nor of truth." In the course of an opinion, Justice Holmes remarked only recently, "those who won our independence by revolution were not cowards. They did not fear political change. They did not exalt order at the cost of liberty." For fear either that it will led to tyranny, that it will block progress and breed revolutions or that society will stagnate and experiments in better social forms stand outlawed, repression of opinion meets with unqualified condemnation at the hands of America's most eminent and respected men of affairs.

Still, in practice, America has its Tom Mooney and Billings, Tampa, Smottsboto, Sheriffs and vigilantes to put down rural agitation and smash workers' strikes, laws of sedition and criminal anarchy and suppression of freedom in education. Only with these 'affairs' and laws as the background, can one expect to understand the nature and extent of the American Civil Liberties movement.

The Mooney-Billings case, as has been suggested, is 'the civil counterpart of the great French Military Scandal,' the Dreyfus affair. Mooney and Billings were trade unionists before they were arrested on a charge of bomb-throwing in 1916. The industrialists, particularly the shipowners and the railway and electric corporations, of North California were then smarting under the 'closed shop' and the organisational strength of workers that were in no small measure due to Mooney. During the days of war hysteria, a dynamite exploded in the rear of a patriotic parade in California and the crime was fastened upon Mooney and his associates. They were sentenced to a life term and it is now twenty years since they are held in prison. Prosecution witnesses, on whose evidence the original conviction followed, have been, one by one, proved to be unreliable and the presentation of testimony to be perjured. Congressional records and Federal enquiries reveal the then District Attorney as a crook who manufactured evidence. State officials have been shown up as men of the California Chambers of Commerce and the private-owned Railways. Positive photographic evidence of Mooney's *alibi* has been obtained by accident. Judge Griffin, who presided at Mooney's trial, says, "there can be

no two opinions. There is now no evidence against him. There is not even a serious suggestion that it exists."

Still, Mooney and Billings continue to languish away in prison. The reason for this was recently given by a California editor "It is quite beside the point whether or not they are guilty of the particular crimes of which they were charged and convicted. The question is : are Mooney and Billings the sort of people we want to run at large ? We have decided this in the negative and we have locked them up. We intend to keep them there."

Mooney and Billings are victism of case-fixing and frame-up and miscarriage of justice. They are symbolic of a judicial and political administration that too blatantly on the side of big property.

Since March 25, 1931, nine Negro boys are held in an Amrican prison on a charge of assault and rape on two white girls. They were travelling on a freight train when they were provoked to a fight by a few white boys. The white boys were thrown off the train, and, on their telephonic information, an infuriated mob met the train at Scottsboro in the State of Alabama. Two white girls, hoboing on the same train, lodged a complaint of rape in order to escape a charge of vagrancy. Race hysteria and Ku Klux Klan did the rest Medical evidence showed that the girls had lied One girl subsequently retracted her testimony. The United States Supreme Court has twice reversed previous convictions. And yet the Negro boys are held in prison.

In Alabama, the Courts and the State administration are ridden by race-hatred and the fiendish desire legally or illegally to lynch Negroes. The Negroes are underprivileged and live under the dictatorial rule of their economic masters, the former slave-owners of the South.

In Tampa, in the State of Florida, a man, who wanted to change the administration of the country and fought for the rights and liberties of the people, was illegally kidnapped and flogged to death by the regular State police. The Tampa Police and the ku-klux-klan knights of the whitehood deliberately burnt Joseph Shoe-maker and poured boiling tar on his body. The Committee for the Defence of Civil Rights in Tampa informed after Shoe-maker's death has disclosed the widespread influence exercised by the gambling dens and the cigar manufactures and their hired gangmen on the State administration. No one who chooses to

organise workers, employed and unemployed, for a better living and a superior Government is safe at their hands

The suppression of civil liberties on the land, that is, in the villages is quite as widespread and acute. The fall in agricultural prices coupled with the heavy fixed charges of the monopolists, the railroad interests and the banking groups have reduced the farmers, particularly of South and West America, to dire straits. Out of these economic conditions ever since 1932, rural struggles have developed to an unprecedented extent and variety There has been a corresponding increase in the use of repressive measures, private and official, directed against the farmers. Ground down by poverty and hunger, if the small land-owning farmers and farm labourers choose to agitate and struggle, they are confornted with a ferocious resistance. Mass movements, for example, against chattel-mortgage fore-closures appeared all over the country as early as February 1933 and auction sales became impossible. The organised and determined farmers succeeded in forbidding high bids and what is commonly known as "penny sales" took place. Farm machinery brought anything upto 8 cents (4 annas) an item and a team of horses went for 12 cents. Courts and officers sought to prevent this. Leaders of such protest against fore-closure sales were punished with fines or with imprisonment In the year 1933, over 200,000 dairy farmers, oppressed by low prices paid them by monopoly milk companies, organised into new farmer groups and resorted to strikes. They picketed the roads leading into towns where creameries and cheese factories were located. Strike breaking trucks were escorted by the hired gangmen of the milk companies as also the State militia. Armed encountres were a frequent occurrence and a large number of farmers was thrown into jail.

In the Southern States of America, a vicious system of land tenure prevails which is commonly known as share-cropping. The share-croppers, of whom Negroes form a very high percentage, own neither land nor means of cultivation. They are virtually the serfs of the big landowner who is legally entitled to a one-half share of the produce but, in fact, extorts whatever he likes. Attempts to organise these share-croppers and tenants and awaken them to a sense of theie rights have met with violent reprisals. The organisers are attacked by private guards of the ku-klux-klan and sheriffs together with the State judiciary have been fairly active

with their prisons and lawcourts. Banning of meetings and their voilent dispersal are frequent practices.

As the valuable brochure of the American Civil Liberties Union. "The Struggle for Civil Liberty on the Land," put it : Vigilantes, mobs, troops, sheriffs gunmen—legal and illegal agencies alike—have been brought into play against rural agitation.

In the American colonies Philippines, Puerto Rico, Virgin Islands, Hawaii, Samoa and Guam, Haiti peaceful assembly for the redress of grievance is often prohibited, the right of free speech is severely curtailed by laws of sedition and repressive measures such as use of military, banning of organisations and exiling of 'undesirables' are not an uncommon practice. In another brochure of the Union, the main causes of such restrictions are shown to be : (1) the imposition of an American culture, based on the assumption of the superiority of Anglo-Saxon civilisation, (2) the penetration of American commercial interests and their support by the Government as against the interests of the colonial peoples, (3) centralised and arbitrary government by American officials, many either navy officers or with their mentality, (4) absence of legislation in protection of civil rights such as the right to agitate for independence and that of peasants and workers to organise associations for the betterment of their conditions.

Laws of sedition and criminal anarchy and of compulsory patriotism in educational Institutions very seriously suppress freedom of speech and of imparting of information in several States of America. In Indiana, for example, a statement that 'people can force Congress to change conditions' was construed as sedition and a heavy sentence was the outcome. In several States, teachers are required to take oaths of loyalty. Libraries are cleansed of books and text books of passages that are deemed objectionable by the State administration. Certain subjects of study are ruled out as vicious. Strict censorship over students' papers is attempted. Auditoriums of schools, which by right belong to the people for purposes of lawful meetings, are refused to political organisations of a radical profession.

This illustrative background of the wide array of affairs and laws in the United States of America will have shown the dangers to the civil liberties of the people, that lie or lurk in the Government of the country. The struggle for civil liberties on the land

and in Tampa shows the extent of organised private violence that is tolerated and even encouraged by Government of several States. The political machinery of numerous States is more or less in the employ of big interests and officers of Law and police are not better than case-fixers, oppressive gangmen and fabricants of evidence, Practically all the cases described here reveal the enormous miscarriage of justice. Scottsboro affair and repression in colonies demonstrate the ruthless oppression of imperialist interests when they find a convenient sanction the mob hysteria of racial domination. And above it all, are the laws of sedition and of assembly, the restrictions on Negroes rights and on freedom in education, that choke all efforts for the reform of abuses in justice and administration and nation economy.

Let us remember the exalted conception of civil rights held by eminent American in the past as also now. This conception is also enshrined in the following articles of the Bill of Right of the Federal Constitution.

No law shall abridge the freedom of speech or of the press and of the right of the people peacefully to assemble. No warrant shall be issued but upon probable cause, supported by oath or affirmation, and parttticularly describing the place to be searched, and the persons or things to be seized. No person shall be deprived of life, liberty, or property, without due process of law. No person shall be denied the equal protection of laws. Excessive bail shall not be required, nor excessive fines imposed, nor cruel and unusual punishments inflicted. Why then is this inhuman variance of practice from the laws permitted ? Is it that public vigilance is not sufficiently strong ? Or, is it, that the conception of civil rights first arose in the struggle between feudal absolutism and modern industry, which, like the poacher turned gamekeeper, has no use left for its former ideas, now that it is engaged in a deadly combat with the masses both at home and in the colonies ? Perhaps, it is both.

No one can, however, accuse the American Civil Liberties Union of inactivity or lack of vigilance. In its annual story of the fight for civil liberty, which is a precious document of far-reaching social importance, it gives a close-up survey of all manners of suppression and of the forces ranged on the two sides. The Union plans its campaigns for the year and those of the running year further testify its vigilance. Under the four sections of Freedom

of opinion, Rights of Labour, Censorship and Racial Minorities it evolved a fight an 14 different fronts. Under Freedom of Opinion, they comprise opposition to all forms to gag legislation and to restrictions of freedom in education and campaigns for the release of political prisoners, for changes in the immigration and deportation laws and for the setting aside of all recognised public places in all areas or cities for purposes of meetings and organisation. The Rights of Labour and Peasantry include the right to organise, strike and picket and the right of the unemployed to organise and demonstrate. Under the Section of Censorship is understood the fight for freedom of the radio by requiring equal facilities for all sides of controversial topics and opposition to Censor's control over motion pictures, books and plays and the post office. The fight for racial minorities consists of campaigns against lynching and for Negroes' civil rights and for civil forms of Government for the colonies.

Freedom of opinion is the rock-bottom of the concept of civil liberties held by the Americans Union. All through its various activities and the copious literature that the Union ceaselessly produces, there runs a single thread of the historic American position on the freedom of speech. No expression of opinion shall be punished, even if it extends up to the advocacy of violent overthrow of Government. Opinion to the punished must be accompanied by an overt act of revolt. It is easy enough to imagine the vast labour that must be undertaken in any country to approximate the actual practices of Government to this ideal concept of civil liberties. Laws of sedition have to be radically changed and a constant vigil kept on the decisions of law-courts. Public opinion is a potent instrument and the conscience of the people must not be allowed to relapse into a state of indolence or perversity, so that it may always revolt against laws and decisions contrary to the right of unlimited freedom of opinion. Dark interests will, of course, tenaciously cling to their power and raise scares of insecurity and violence and disloyalty and revolution to hack at the civil rights of the people. Lest the people should be deluded to forego their lights and, even to support those who would restrict their freedom, these scares have to be exposed and fought against. On a more theoretical plane too attacks have been directed against the basic civil right of unrestricted freedom of opinion. It is argued that such freedom can be granted only to those who

will secure it to their opponents when they have attained control over the State. The American Union had rightly described this argument as highbrow; for, whatever the reasons adduced for the propriety of governmental control ever opinion, all the corollaries of such a control, suppression and tyranny and social stagnation and blocking of progress, flow in as soon as its propriety is admitted. If society is to progress, no theory nor argument shall restrict the basic civil right of the people to express any opinion unaccompanied by an overt act. It is time enough to punish people when they actually resort to revolutionary action.

It will be seen that the American Union is not quite so extensive in its field of operations as the French League. It is, however, a very assiduous watch-dog of the civil rights of the people in the narrow sense of the term. No doubt, in its effort to secure freedom of speech and the right to organise and picket and proper dispensation of justice, it is faced with social and economic conditions which, as in France, are the roots of all mischief. No doubt every attack on civil liberties is but a reflection of certain basic social condition. A thoroughgoing investigation into acts of suppression of civil rights has thrown very instructive sidelights on the economy and the political management of the country, as with Scottsboro, Tampa, Mooney and Sharecroppers. Insofar, a campaign for civil liberties resolves indirectly into a campaign against social abuses. The concept of civil liberties, therefore, includes indirectly the campaigns for reform in administration, police and judiciary and for the suppression of private gangsterism.

The American Civil Liberties Union has over 3,000 members and contributors. Over 5,000 persons are active in one way or another in its work. This number includes 700 co-operating attorneys, 800 correspondents and investigators and 500 speakers, writers and churchmen who have volunteered their services. The ultimate control of policies rests in a National Committee which represents every shade of economic and political opinion and includes lawyers, teachers, clergymen, editors, businessmen and labour organisers. The Union is managed by a Board of Directors and the work of the national headquarters at New York is in the hands of a director, a staff counsel, a secretary and a publicity director. It has a representative in Washington, State chairman in 41 states, and branches in 23 cities. The operating expenses of the

Union are about 20,000 dollars a year (Rs. 60,000) and its annual financial assistance in legal aid goes up to 10,000 dollars. Distributed all over the country, the co-operating attorneys assist in legal advice and defence; the correspondents investigate into breaches of civil rights as they arise from time to time, collect all relevant information and report to headquarters; the writers, speakers and clergymen make an appeal to public conscience and develop national campaigns. The Union was organised in 1920 and has issued over 40 brochures and other mimeographed material. Its Weekly Press Releases (Bulletins) which go out to several hundred newspapers and periodicals over the country adready amount to over 750.

Publicity is the soul of all civil liberties agitation and the American Union is keenly, conscious of it. Aside of numerous publications and national compaigns, the Union makes individual appeal to all who read its puclibations. In each of these, there is a series of "commandments" under "what you can do" exhorting readers to write to the editor of their newspaper asking for editorial comment on the subject matter of the particular pamphlet, to utilise the material in their conversations and speeches and to send protests, individually as also through their organisation, against the specific breach of civil liberties detailed in the pamphlet.

There are no doubt other sectional agencies like the International Labour Defence, the Association for the advancement of Coloured Peoples, Scottsboro Defence Committee, Defence of Civil Right in Tampa, which engage in the defence of specific civil liberties. But, the Civil Liberties Union is always there and it is a happy sign that of late sufficient goodwill and solidarity among all these organisation has come into being to give the civil liberties movement in America added strength and enthusiastic determination.

There is also the International Committee for Political Prisoners, which was formed in 1924 and which is designed solely so deal with appeals for protests and aid on behalf of victims of political persecution in other countries. In its annual survey of persecution abroad, the Committee estimated for 1933 a total of 230,000 political prisoners for the world, which India contributed they very large number of 40,000. The Committee has published several brochures such as, Political Persecution throughout the World and

Venezuela Land of Oil and Tyranny.

Our account of the Civil Liberties Movement in America, will however, be incomplete, unless we pay a personal tribute to Roger N. Baldwin who is the chief of American libertarians and to whose untiring efforts and will is due the success and growth of the American Civil Liberties Union.

CIVIL LIBERTIES IN ENGLAND

It is only in recent years that the English citizen has begun to experience attacks upon his civil liberties. During the latter half of the nineteenth century and till before the outbreak of the world war, the Englishman had settled down to a comparatively unbroken enjoyment of the rights of free speech and assembly and association and equal justice which he had won after great efforts. Right from the days of the mediaeval Magna Charta upto the nineteenth century Chartist revolt for democray and the Tolpuddle martyrdom of workers who had dared to form Trade Unions of the working-class, the fight for social changes and for civil rights had been waged. Social progress had later become possible in England without basic transference of power from one class to another. This was due to a variety of reasons such as the possession of the world's best industrial machinery and the largest colonial domains. What the American ruling caste did to the Negroes and the emigrant workers at home, the English could conveniently shift upon the colonial peoples. The English middle classes and the working class were fairly prosperous and participated, however meagrely, in the spoils of their ruling caste they did not clamour for basic social changes and their civil rights were consequently untouched. Post-war England is, however, different. Social progress is now become dependent on disturbance in the control of political power. The fight for social progress, therefore, involves governmental attacks on the civil liberties of such citizens as seek such a progress and, therefore, a basic transference of political power. Civil Liberties have now acquired a new meaning and, though won after continuous sacrifices, they have to be fought for again. Whoever is for democracy as the basis of social progress, whatever his other opinions on different economic and political systems may be, he lines up in this broad front of civil liberties against the autocracy and misuse of executive power.

In view of the fact that the traditions of civil liberties are particularly strong in the country and that a cry raised on an issue of freedom of opinion or organisation can rally large sections, flagrant breaches of the American or the colonial type are still uncommon. The attacks are directed more in isolated localities and on details of police and executive procedure and, oftener, in an indirect manner. Not that such indirect and subtler curtailment in the liberties of citizens does not take place in other countries and that the American and the French Civil Liberties Unions do not have to combat it with vigilance. But, the activities of the British Union provide a more instructive field for the study of such subtle attacks of the Government on citizens' rights, even as the Union's major operations are directed against them.

Certain methods of the police securely sheltered from the public eye, which are quite contrary to law but are commonly practised, have of recent been widely talked about in England They relate to the prevalent irregularities of wrongful arrests, of the questioning in regard to offences, of the influence on lower courts for refusal of bail and of wrongful detensions. "Suspected persons" are arrested on the flimsiest evidence of their "loitering with intent" and, it is believed, that the number of such wrongful arrests has increased in recent years. Individual policemen, often with an eye on promotion, effect the arrest of persons who, they allege, are loitering about suspiciously. To expose this police action of wrongful arrests, publicity in the newspapers and in the House of Commons has become necessary.

It is also the usual practice of the police to question a prisoner as to any offences of which he may be suspected other than that in connection with which he is in custody. That is clearly a violation of individual liberty. The Report of the Royal Commission on Police Powers and Procedure (1929) went so far as to recommend that the police should be rigidly instructed not to question a person in custody or in prison about any crime or offence with which he is or may be charged. There is a view, and that seems to be the proper view on civil liberties, that no statement, voluntary or otherwise, made of the police should be permitted as evidence. The police also exercises influence on the lower courts and police courts in the grant of bails At the behest of the police, bails are either refused or excessive demands are made. This is a practice which requires a constant searchlight of publicity and exposure.

In fact, so does the entire atmosphere of a police station which, as a Judge remarked sometime ago is "singularly conducive to confessions." The use by the police of agent provacateurs and the detention of arrested persons, while the police decide whether any charge shall be brought, are illegal practices and, yet, widespread.

Obsolete laws which have not been used for a century and over are now being revived. Legislation, in its executive application, is made to depart from its original designs and put to uses other than those intended by the legislators. Thus, for example, a law made a hundred years ago to prevent 'blowing a horn or a noisy instrument' was recently used by the policy to prevent a loud speaker campaign for the Peace Ballot. At the same time, the commercial use of noisy instruments against which the law was directed is allowed without hindrance. An example of how an obsolete law is revived is the Statute of Edward III, passed in 1361, which has recently been used to imprison persons who have done nothing but who the Government suspect might say something dangerous. As the declaration of principles of the British Civil Liberties Union says, "These restrictions are the danger signals. The only way to preserve freedom of speech is to resist now, before it is too late, each individual infringement wherever it is attempted."

Police bans, departmental encroachments and local legislation which have no legal validity, have, of recent, tended to restrict severely the right of free assembly and procession. The English law on processions has, through a continuous series of court decisions, become very liberal so that there is no legal justification for an advance ban by the police on processions nor is a subsequent conviction easily obtainable in the case of moving processions on a charge of obstruction to traffic. Recent attempts have, however, been made by the police to ban processions in advance or disperse them by force. One such attempt in Manchester aroused such a storm of protest from prominent politicians and publicmen of the country that the City Constable, despite his own ban, allowed the procession and demonstration to take place. An Armistice Day Procession in Blackburn, Planned as a demonstration against War and Fascism, was banned by the local Chief Constable but, when the Council for Civil Liberties sent a telegram and a letter of protest, the ban was withdrawn on the following day. Certain other orderly processions have been dispersed with baton charges

and arrests were made. The Council is following up the matter by interpellations in the House of Commons.

The law regarding meetings is not quite as liberal as that on processions. Still, there are traditional meeting-places in practically every area of the country where public gatherings have been held for generations. Of recent, the police has attempted to ban such meetings on the plea of obstruction to traffic. A serious interference with the right of assembly is the so-called "Trenchard Ban" on all meetings outside Labour Exchanges, where the unemployed pass in que for work or relief. The Council has helped in the organising of test meetings and contesting of test law-suits with varying success. There is the famous "Duncan Case" in which Mrs. Duncan is charged with obstructing a police officer in the execution of his duty, because she insisted on holding a meeting as there was no obstruction to traffic. The Council is assisting the case by way of press propaganda and arrangement of legal defence.

The Council also directs its campaigns against cases of political discrimination and victimisation. The refusal of the lessees of the Albert. Hall, for example, to let their hall for a type of political meeting arouses protest from the Council as much as the victimisation of a professor or a teacher in an educational institution who is known to express pronounced views on such subjects as war and peace. The Council has often had to bring to light the opposition of the British Broadcasting Corporation to the judicial and fair presentation of differing views. That all this amounts to a curtailment of the freedom of thought and expression, there is no doubt In some of these cases, the Government is directly involved. In view, however, of the subtle manner in which this censorship over thought is exercised, it is not strange that a highly developed sense of civil rights is preliminary to preventing it.

England, however, is not altogether devoid of major attacks on her civil liberties. The Incitement to Disaffection Act of 1934, as it has possed both Houses of Parliament, is to an extent different in its scope and provisions from the original plans of its sponsors, Still, under pretext of safeguarding His Majesty's Forces from incitement to disaffection or rebellion, stringent clauses have been enacted which will tend to suppress freedom of opinion in the country. As it has been pointed out in a statement

of the Council, it will be very difficult for the publisher of a book, pamphlet or newspaper to put in a strong defence, as the very existence of such literature, even though it may not have been expressly written for the army, might seduce a soldier. The Government had persistently refused to accept an amendment which would have limited the operation of the Act to literature devised and intended for the armed Forces. It is clear, therefore, that such literature as seeks to educate the public on the causes of war, the destruction that it effects and the measures to prevent such a calamity, though it may not contain a direct and special appeal to the soldiery, may be held objectionable under the scope of this Act. Moreover, the Act arms the magistracy with large powers of a general search. As the Council points out, such powers are capable of being used for political purposes, to enable the police to gain entry to the offices of political societies on which a single copy of an objectionable literature may be found. Assurances have of course been given by the Government that such wide powers will scarcely be used. But it is clear that behind the pretext of keeping intact the loyalty of the soldiery, a major attack on the freedom opinion and its expression has been made by the Government through the Act. The Council has throughout the career of this legislation expressed a determined opposition to it and has succeeded in toning it down considerable. A much larger success achieved is the awakening of the consciousness of the British citizen to the menace of repression. This has been due largely to the vigilance of the Council which, within 48 hours of the publication of the text of the Bill, analysed its provisions and emphasised their dangerous character. This analysis was circulated to every member of the House of Commons. Meetings and demonstrations at which numerous political, religious, and other organisations participated were also organised. A Conference was organised in opposition to this legislation composed of 1600 delegates who were official delegates of scieties representing every phase of progressive thought. A mass demonstration organised by the Council in Trafalgar Square was described by the press as having drawn together all progressive elements to a degree never known before. Whatever may be the provisions of this legislation, the British citizen is now definitely awakened to the danger that it represents to his liberty and will not so lightly tolerate its executive application. Already certain printers have refused to print entirely legal

material in fear of possible punishment under this Act and the Council has made this an issue in its campaign against the Act.

In England a large mass of legal standards, regulating the relation between the government and the citizen, has grown up through a series of Parliamentary enactments and, more particularly, the decision of law courts. The National Council for Civil Liberties takes its stand on this heritage of liberty and has in its declaration classified this heritage under six heads. They are: freedom of speech, freedom of assembly, freedom of association, freedom of thought and expression, full rights for all people under the British Parliament, democratic control of Government. We have already seen the manner in which the Government is seeking to curtail this freedom. The Council, therefore, has more ample opportunities than sister organisations in other countries of directing its attention to the details of executive and police procedure. It has, therefore, rightly stated in its declaration that "National Liberty is in a great measure the sum of local liberties and freedom as a whole will be preserved to the extent that men and women in their work and in their own localities resist legal encroachment upon their rights". In England it is not the law nor its judicial application that has yet become such a danger to civil liberties as it has in America. It is the irregular action of the police and other local bodies which though not so monstrously outspoken as a bad law or a bad decision hits at the liberties of the people. Insofar the concept of civil liberties of the British Union is emphasised by this opposition to executive and police action contrary to due processes of law.

The Council has also stood up for democratic control over Government. It opposes the recent practices of the Executive to put into force its measures and, only subsequently, submit them to Parliament for necessary legislation. The Council considers that, in the measure legislative functions are assumed by the Government departments and the Civil Service, the liberty of the citizen is curtailed. The vigilance of the Council is not confined to England, for its espouses the cause of all peoples under British Parliament. In the colonies of Gambia, Nigeria Trinidad, Sierra, Leona and others and in India, political parties and meetings are banned and leaders arrested and imprisoned without trial. The extent of its activities in behalf of victims of colonial oppression is discernible in its statement, "History shows that attacks on the freedom of

Englishmen at home are lways preceded by attacks on the rights of British subjects abroad." Ronald Kidd, the present Secretary of the Council, is actively associating himself with the campaign in England for Indian Civil Liberties.

The National Council for Civil Liberties was formed at the begining of 1934, when the country was agitated on the provisions of the Incitement to Disaffection Bill. The need of a non-party and undenominational organisation was acutely felt. Such an organisation could concentrate into a single channel the diffused efforts of many political and other bodies. The Council has an Executive Committee of not more than 24 members which controls its day to day action. It takes associate members on a minimum annual subscription of five shillings and has succeeded in establishing several branches.

Among other activities the Council has developed a particular from of organisation, which it calls Vigilance Committees. These Committees consisting of prominent writers and publicmen are sent to act as observers on the spot when processions and demonstrations are organised by one political party or the other. This institution has considerably curbed the irregular activities of the police who are afraid of the evidence of distinguished men and women in the law courts. The Council for example organised a Vigilance Committee of 30 persons consisting of such prominent men as Prof. Lasky, Mr. H.G. Wells, Mr. Nevinson, to report on cases of violence or irregularity, on the occasion of simultaneous fascist and anti-fascist demonstrations in the Hyde Park of London. A temporary headquarter with a telephone was established for the day near the park and the Committee was to mix with the crowd in batches of two. Complaints of irregularities could thus be communicated at once on the telephone.

In its instructions to branches, members and affiliated societies, the Council has noted nine heads on which reports should be made. The relate to banning of or interferences with : (1) meetings, (2) processions, (3) propaganda, (leaflets, loud-speakers, etc.), (4) irregular police actions, (5) censorship over literature, films, plays, radio, newspaper press and printers' refusal to print under Incitement to Disaffection Act, (6) victimisation for political, racial or religious reasons, (7) cases of search or prosecution under the Disaffection Act, (8) refusal of passport for political views, (9) unwarranted deportations for political views. The branches,

members and others are required to report to the Council's Headquarters in England on any breaches of Civil Liberties under the foregoing heads and are at the same time expected to lodge complaints locally.

We have, until now, considered the civil liberties of the citizen. There are special societies all over the world to watch over the rights of the citizen when he is tranformed into a prisoner. One such society, the British "Howard League for Penal Reform", has been better publicised in India than such other organisations of a similar type as the "International Penal and Penitentiary Commission" of Berne. Standard Minimum Rules for the treatment of Prisoners have been prepared and the League of Nations has accorded them its seal of approval. These rules relate to the prisoner's food, work, accommodation and bedding, health and medical services, punishments, prison staff etc. It is rather surprising that the Government of India should have declared in its 1935 report to the League of Nations that these rules are already in force in this country. The Howard League has however, published a number of violations in different parts of the world without naming the countries and it will not be very misleading to imagine that India is included on the list of violaters. The Howard League works on an international scale and is ready to fight in the cause of prisoners anywhere.

THE CONCEPT OF CIVIL LIBERTIES

In order to arrive at an understanding of what civil liberties are, it is necessary to go into their conceptual extent, origins, present state and contemplated actions to maintain them. An enquiry under these four heads : What is the number and types of civil liberties ? How did they arise ? How and why are they attacked today ? Why and how should they be defended ? will yield us the concept of civil liberties ?

What is the number and types of civil liberties ? We have only to string together the epochal statements of state-builders and the basic doctrines of organic laws and court decisions. These doctrines and statements have related to various types of civil liberties. At the head of them all stands leberty of person and movement and the sanctity of dwellings. "The aim of the State is the conservation of natural rights of man; these rights are

liberty, property, security and resistance to oppression," lays down an article of French Constitution of 1789. No one shall be arrested and detained or imprisoned without due processes of law. Such processes have gradually come to include an open trial by jury, whose predominating element is drawn out of the same class of men as the accused. Everyone shall be secure in his house, which will not be broken into and searched unless on charge of a definite and specified act of lawlessness. No restrictions shall be imposed on the freedom of a citizen to move about in the country and to obtain passports in order to travel abroad.

In this age of great mass efforts and people's awakening, the liberties of opinion and assembly are as important as those of person and dwellings. The standard in regard to freedom of expression by speech or press is the American dictum that no opinion, whatever its revolutionary import, may be punished unless it is accompanied by an overt act of revolt. The standard in regard to freedom of assembly and processions is the English doctrine that, unless serious obstruction to traffic can be proved, the police or the executive may not take any action. These doctrines imply the abolition of sedition laws and of censorship over press, books, post and radio. Ban orders on meetings and processions are also impermissible. Equal rights shall be granted to everyone to hold meetings in public halls and such areas in every town and village as are traditionally used for purposes of assembly.

Together with the two types of civil liberties relating to person and opinion, the freedom of association and organisation has been steadily acquiring a unique significance. In order that larger masses of men may translated their keen interest in State affairs and economic management into organised effort to remove existing evils, they must in no event be robbed of their precious freedom to organise and strike and picket. The executive might often pretend and advertise the fear that such strikes or organisations will eventually lead to breaches of peace and the spread of a revolutionary mentality and, thus, seek to interfere with this precious freedom. Such attempts have to be resisted and exposed and, short of an overt act, the freedom to organise and strike should be allowed to be tampered with.

"Law is an expression of the general will" was laid down in an article of the 1789 French Constitution. State authortty is to

originate from the will of the people and thus democratic control over the Government is considered as an important type of civil liberties. The Government may not act secretly nor without the previous permission of a democratically elected assembly. In some form or the other the civil liberties unions of the world have accepted democratic control over ›the Government and even the republican form as one of their agitational planks.

The rights of racial minorities come within the extent and scope of a civil liberties agitation. The persecution of racial minorities is obviously a reflection of unequal laws as also unequal dispensation of justice and is therefore an attack on the civil liberties of a section of citizens. Thus, the Civil Liberties Union of America lays especial emphasis on the protection of Negroes and the British and French Unions on that of the colonial peoples.

Freedom of conscience and thought and education is properly speaking a part of liberty of opinion. This freedom must however be especially emphasised insofar as all interference takes place within the precincts of governmental or semi-governmental institutions. If a professor or a teacher is dismissed from his job for expressing opinions unsavoury to the administration and denominational or communal institutions are encouraged by the government, the liberties of free conscience and education are directly attacked without serious possibilities of appeal.

The demand for the release of political prisoners is yet another aspect of civil liberties. Most convictions are based on a legal and judicial system, which is too heavily weighted in favour of the government as against the citizen. A fight against this system would obviously entail protection of its victims and, therefore, the release of political prisoners is a demand of civil liberties. Pending such release, the rights of prisoners in relation to food, accommodation, punishments, intellectual provisions and the like have to be fought for.

The conceptual extent of civil liberties is now clear. It embraces the rights of the citizen in regard to security both of his person and of dwellings, to freedom of opinion and assembly, thought and organisation, to equal justice and control over the Government and to release from political convictions.

How did they arise? The concept of civil liberties is an outcome of the struggle that the citizen has eternally waged

against his State. Throughout history, the State and its laws have given rise to manifold types of abuses. Whether it was an oppressive tax system or a bloodthirsty landed aristocracy, the citizen groaned and attempted to resist. Wars and cultural stagnation were forced on him and he sought to end them. In his efforts, however, to end oppression and existing evils, he was met with stern repression. The authority in whom State-power was vested did not brook the defiance, which was naturally involved in the struggle against abuses and evils. The wrath of the State fell down on the citizen who tried to be critical. He suffered long and solitary confinements, quite often death, and his most precious possessions were snatched away from him. He, therefore, stood in need of a minimum basis of safety from where he could launch attacks on the abuses and evils of his times. The rights of the citizen in opposition to the Government, as enshrined in the organic and ordinary law of different lands, are an expression of such a minimum basis of safety. If a regime of civil liberties prevails, resistance to oppression is not attended with frightful consequences.

It is instructive to recall the occassions of the American and French Constitutions and the English Bills of Rights. In each case, much oppression and many social and financial abuses had preceded. Bastilles of one type or the other had been built to frighten people into submission and acceptance of conditions as they obtained. When finally the peoples had gathered sufficient strength to smash the State and its economic and social laws, they overthrew the Bastilles. On the runins of the Bastilles was reared the imposing structure of civil liberties. It was an organic defence against the living memory of persecutions and repression.

Civil liberties comparatively smoothen society's march towards progress. Society is being eternally pulled between reaction and progress and, often, degenerates into a state of stagnation. In this pull, the State has more often been controlled by forces of stagnation and reaction. There are, of course, brief-interludes when former rebels, in the initial stages of their power, have used the State as an agency of progress. Soon however the rebels acquire a distaste and hatred of all changes and the powerful machine of the State is directed against the progressive efforts of the dispossessed. Lest the State should turn into a terrible obstruction to progress and continually block it by its repression,

its supreme authority over the citizens stands in need of description and curtailment. The entire scheme of citizens' rights is an outcome of the effort to describe and curtail State-authority. In this manner, orderly social progress becomes possible and society is not continually faced with the choice between tyranny and revolution. The concept of civil liberties is thus essentially a liberal concept which acts as a shock-absorber of the cruel impact between State tyranny and mass revolts. It enables society's march towards progress to proceed on orderly lines. If a citizen chooses to be critical of the world in which he lives, society permits him to question and experiment without fear of serious reprisals.

Why are civil liberties attacked today ? The answer is obvious. A titanic world struggle is going on before our eyes between the forces of *status quo* and reaction and those of progress. Whether in the colonies or among the masses in imperialist countries, banners of criticism and revolt have been raised against the prevailing economic and political system. This system has meant progressive deterioration in employment and living conditions and cultural attainments and is ever resulting in humiliations for the colonial peoples and barbaric wars. The whole world is a vast question mark and old social structures are being tested and found wanting. The colonial peoples and oppressed masses all over the world are thinking out an alternative Society and are propagating and organising and striking for its acceptance. And so the State is weighting the struggle in favour of the existing society and answers the cry for alternatives with stern assests and bans.

It is instructive to remember that it is the national freedom movement in the colonies and the socialist and communist parties of the world that are the worst sufferers. They suffer because they are voicing the demand for alternatives of the colonials and peasants and labourers of the world. Against them are pitted the powers of *status quo*, the force of finance and imperialist capital and landed aristocracy. The Governments throw overboard the concept of civil liberties and go out of the pale of their described and limited authority. And so attacks on the civil liberties of citizens have become a permanent instrument of the State and the class policy of finance capital and landed aristocracy

It is desirable here to go into the stray enquiries, made for some time past in our country, that assume the function of civil

liberties as being divided into a religious or a political or an economic scope. It is obvious that such enquiries rest on a misconception. There are no religious or political or economic civil liberties as such. The question of civil liberties arises only when the constituted authority of the State fails to safeguard them to its citizens either by acts of commission or, less often, through those of omission. Civil liberties are violated when the State either itself attacks the various freedoms of opinion and association of its citizens or permits private gangsterdom to do so. The basic factor in all such State and private violence is the fear of criticism and revolt against the existing system of laws and government.

How are Civil Liberties violated ? In the first instance, laws of detention, house-searches, sedition, censor and association and codes of criminal procedure practically all over the world militate against the fundamental guarantees of civil iiberties. These laws and codes are either frankly repressive or deliberately vague. In either case they deliver the citizen to the caprices of the Executive. Secondly, the executive and judicial administrations of the world are trying increasingly to conquer every inch of territory that they had to concede to liberty and justice. This they do in all manner of ways Justice is severely and often faulty applied; imprisonment and heavy sentences out of all proportion to the offence have become very usual. The executive issues edicts which could not be defended in a properly constituted court of law and otherwise, seeks to corrupt and frighten public opinion by State subsidies, propagandist scares and secret action. Thirdly, in the dark chambers of the police, shielded from public eye, excesses are done and third degree methods used. Often, the police stretches the law much beyond its proper scope. Illegal detention and forced statements and threats of drastic action are usual. Fourthly, private violence in the employ of the State or of vested interests is permitted and encouraged This is particularly done in the villages. In their total effect, the four types of violations restrict the right of the citizen to hold meetings and form associations and propagate thought through books, newspapers and radio. The citizen becomes an easy prey to dismissal from his job, police-torture, detention and heavy sentences.

How should civil liberties be defended ? The Civil Liberties Unions of the world have developed an efficient mechanism of

branches and local correspondents who throw the searchlight of publicity on legal, judicial, executive, police and private excesses and prepare dossiers of each individual case. Action is taken on each individual report. Interventions on behalf of the victims are made with the authorities, With the voluntary aid of prominent speakers, writers, solicitors and public men, the national headquarters develop mass compaigns against specific laws, for individual affairs, for public enquiries and free trial and for release of detenus and political prisoners. They also organise legal defence. The publicity apparatus of special press releases, brochures and other publications is evolved.

Why should civil liberties be defended ? The question is obviously absurd and yet it is not seldom asked. Why should we defend your civil liberties; would you, were you in power, safegard these to us ? Again, the advice is often given to those, whose civil liberties are violated, to slow down their agitation against the existing order or, even, to stop it. It is easy to see the implications of both the rhetoric and he advice. Both amount to an acceptance of the *status quo* and a falling in line with the forces of social reaction. Only the hard-boiled reactionary with not shrink before such a prospect. Whoever believes in orderly social progress, and the front extends in normal-times from the conservatives over the liberals to the radicals, lines up in a joint defence of civil liberties.

There is another type of argument, met with among a section of radicals, that seriously whittles down the importance of any special defence of civil liberties. It is asserted that there is not much use of fighting for civil liberties, for, ultimately it is a question of political power. Suppression and repression will willy-nilly take place, so long as critism or an organised action against the existing order are attempted. The ultimate guarantee of civil liberties, therefore, lies in the overthrow of the existing State. The argument that civil liberties can finally be protected only under a different regime is true enough but there is a serious flaw in the deduction that it is not much use fighting for civil liberties.

The special front of civil liberties maintains the backbone of the people. The spirit of opposition against injustice is kept intact The individual gets strength from the knowledge that his resistance to police or executive oppression will awaken common

interest. Again, such a common interest serves to convulse the conscience of the people against encroachment of their liberties. The people are taught to be vigilant and, so they clear the road to progress.

The fight for civil liberties also lays bare political and social abuses which are the fountainhead of all suppression. As in the American fight for civil liberties in the countryside, facts of economic and political management, which would have otherwise remained unknown, come out in the open. An enquiry into a case of violation of civil liberties is simultaneously an enquiry into the particular abuse against which the individual had fought and for which the wrath of the State and other interests had descended upon him. Thus, the fight for civil liberties awakens the social conscience of the people.

We may not also forget that the front of civil liberties is more broad based and inclusive than that of freedom and progress. Among the ranks of freedom and progress, there may be differences of opinion on other matters but they will all unite on an issue of civil liberties. Their ranks are further strengthened by the inflow of such as have not yet turned into hard-boiled reactionaries. Such a broad-based and inclusive front is a great moulder of public opinion and can also exercise much pressure on the State.

It is also incorrect to say, that, till the final objective of State power is achieved, nothing can be done towards the safeguarding of civil liberties. Such an argument assumes that the existing state-power can do whatever it likes until it is fully defeated. That may be a legal fiction and to a very large extent true, but even the State shrinks from doing certain things lest they should recoil on its head. To restrict, therefore, the factual authority of the State, all manners of trenches should be dug and citadels fortified in defence of people's freedom The agitation for civil liberties is even such a trench and a citadel. In most cases, it may only stiffen public opinion but, in some, the State shall have to bend. There have been cases where previous orders of the Executive or subordinate officials were revoked and release of political prisoners effected in response to an insistent public demand

Violations of civil liberties are not restricted to this country or the other and a large part of the world is today more or less a prison-house. World opinion, as never before, is feeling its way

towards an organised expression and speedily reacts to suppression of liberties, wherever that might take place. If a national Civil Liberties Union exists in different countries, it can also serve as an exchange bureau of international information and propaganda.

The concept of civil liberties is now clear. It defines State-authority within clear limits. It assigns well-defined liberties to the people. The task of the State is to protect these liberties. But, the States usually do not like the task and act contrarily. Armed with the concept of civil liberties, the people develop an agitation to force the State to keep within clear and well-defined limits. The agitation for civil liberties does not directly propagate a change of the existing order, but it attempts to keep the way clear for such as may.

CIVIL LIBERTIES IN INDIA

India has fought hard and bitter struggle to win her civil liberties. Modern India begins in the eighties of the last century with a fight on the issue of equal justice as between the Englishman and the Indian. It was the Ilbert Bill that sought to abolish the preferential justice meted out to Englishmen. The English bureaucracy and the commercial class were alarmed and launched on a violent campaign against the Bill. The Indian people answered by an equally resolute agitation in favour of the Bill and this agitation became the starting point for a sense of political rights in the country. Again, the period of submissive criticism ends and the era of vigorous nationalism is ushered in with a fight for civil liberties. Post-war India was made to suffer the Rowlatt Act and the denial of all human liberties. Jallianwala Bag and crawling on all fours, that followed in its train The first mass action that the country carried out to wrest its freedom from British Imperialism was largely inspired by its revolt against the Rowlatt Act and consequently, the suppression of civil liberties. Since then, there has been no single year when all manner of repressive laws and Acts of the Government have not been a sore point the Indian Nationalism.

Even to ordinary law which governs the liberties of the people is viciously vague and being constantly put to a repressive use. The ordinary law of sedition, which governs freedom of opinion, punishes all expressions that bring the government of the country

into hatred or contempt. Hatred or contempt are vague terms and the line, therefore, between legitimate criticism and seditions utterances is left to be drawn by the magistracy. It is said that the dictum which guides magistrates is that criticism of or protest against particular policies and measures of government is permitted, but any wholesale condemnation of government falls under the law. Here again, it is the magistrate who decides as to whom the condemnation of a particular policy resolves into that of the entire government, and so the difficulty remains. The citizen has, thus, no constitutional nor legal guarantees to defend his freedom of opinion from executive and magisterial encroachment. His expressions need not have caused an overt act of revolt, nor is it necessary to show that he had attempted or even intended to do so, and yet he may be punished for breach of the law of sedition. The citizen's liberties of assembly and organisation are quite as precarious. Under Section 107 of the ordinary Criminal Procedure Code, action is usually taken in the countryside against attempts to form associations on the charge that a breach of the peace was likely. In like manner, wide use is made of Section 144, which empowers the declaration of bans on specified areas and an assembly of more than five men is made punishable. These and several other sections of the criminal law militate against the ordinary liberties of the citizen and deliver him to the caprices of the police and the executive.

When this is the ordinary law, it is not difficult to imagine the deadly grip of emergency laws, variously known as the Criminal Law Amendment Acts, Public Security Acts and the like, on the civil liberties of the people It is true that emergency laws, like the State Prisoner's Regulation of 1818, Press Acts of 1867 and 1910 and the Rowlatt Act of 1919, have been comparatively normal features of Indian administration also in the past. Today the grip is deadlier and, as the Lucknow Congress Resolution says, "at no period since the great Revolt of 1857 has the suppression of the Indian people. . . . been so great as it is now."

In several provinces, security of person and sanctity of dwellings and liberty of movement are practically non-existent. Indefinite detentions without trial, internment, and externment are common in Bengal and the Punjab. The number of Bengal s detenus is computed at over 2000 and, in the month of July alone, about 40 Socialist workers were home or village interned in the

Punjab. It is made a crime, punishable with a sentence of 6 months, for boys of 12 and over to sit and loiter between sunset and sunrise in certain playgrounds, parks and public places of Dacca and Narainganj in Bengal. Large numbers of young men are not allowed to stir out of their houses between sunset and sunrise all over Bengal. The movements of a still large number are strictly confined within narrow town limits and they are frequently required to report themselves to the police once a day. In order to travel to Darjeeling, a passport is necessary. In the town and the interior of the Midnapur district, a special police permit is necessary for riding bicycles. General search warrants are issued and warrantless searches are frequently instituted by subordinate police officers in their own judgment. Security of person is further jeopardised by granting large powers to the police of keeping suspects under prolonged custody. All over the country, visitations by the police at odd hours of the night and day and questionings and pestering are becoming alarmingly usual.

The ordinary law of sedition, Sea Customs Act and the Boards of Censors are in themselves sufficient to put a ban on all advanced opinion, thought and art. And yet there are the one time ordinances, designed to combat the Civil Disobedience and other revolutionary movements, which have been enacted into the ordinary law of the land. The Indian Press Act and other provincial Press Laws have made the freedom of press a mockery. Advance permission of the Government is necessary and security deposits for good behaviour are demanded before a newspaper or periodical may be published. Even the purely literary journals are a victim to this vexatious and embracing interference. Advance securities were demanded of "Hans" and "Bhartiya Sahitya" (Indian Literature), two purely literary monthlies devoted to building up a common platform for the various Indian languages and literatures. Subsequent forfeiture of securities is not rare. The latest instance is that of "Anand Bazar Patrika", a Bengali daily, having to forfeit its security for commenting on "Official Tyranny on Literature" Aside of the Editor and Publisher, the owner of the printing press is also made responsible. It is with immense difficulty, therefore, that movements with scanty resources, such as those of labour; can persuade the owner of a press to print their official organs. The list of newspapers which had to cease publication in recent years because of these laws is formidable—the official number of such

suppressions is 348. Imprisonment of violation of Press Laws is frequent. There have been instances when the publisher of a notice for a public meeting has been awarded a sentence of six months hard labour. Such a notice is a newssheet in the eyes of the law and, as such, requires previous permission of the Government before it can be issued. The Newsletter of the Foreign Department of the Indian National Congress also fell under the provisions of this law and the office of the All-India Congress Committee was raided and a variety of mimeographed material seized.

Bengal suffers strangling restrictions in the shape of a Press Officer who casts his shadow over the entire Press and has constituted himself into a kind of editor-in-chief of all newspapers. He interests himself not only in the views but the news and the method of display and issues warnings. With the threat of action under the Press laws and the judicious dispensation of official advertisements, he also carries on positive propaganda for the Government.

Advanced literature and books are frequently prescribed. There is the all-India banning by the Government of India; in addition each provincial Government prescribes books within its own area. In Bengal, a whole class of literature is banned. A person found in prossession of a book, which is not itself banned but which, in the opinion of a policeman or a subordinate magistrate, belongs to that dangerous class, is liable to a term of imprisonment. The usual sentence for possessing such a book is a year.

Throughout the country, the liberties of assembly and association are constantly violated. Even under the ordinary Trade Union laws, workers are not permitted to strike unless they have, very much in advance, given individual notices to the management. Strikes for political ends are unlawful. Under the special laws of association, Trade Union organisations are speedily declared illegal and the Government is ably assisted by the Anglo-Indian Press in the spreading of scares. As soon as a workers' organisation shows signs of activity, the semi-official press comes out with stories of revolutionary mentality and communist influence and what follows is easy to imagine. In recent years, a large number of Unions of railwaymen, tramways workers, textile workers, crew in inland navigation have come under the ban of the Government. The Bengal Public Security Act of 1932 was styled a "heavy roller" by a former Governor and yet a communique of the Government of

Bengal has conferred, since September, 1936, additional powers, particularly in regard to meetings of industrial workers, on the Commissioner of Police in Calcutta and the neighbouring District Magistrates. The communique remarks on the increasing activity of organisation which use expressions commonly associated with violent revolutionary movements in other parts of the World.

In the countryside. meetings are forcibly dispersed and much private violence is permitted. These have become frequent in the proportion that the peasantry is agitating and organising against tax and rental demands, which bear no relation to its shrunken income. From the province of Behar, where the peasantry is growing restless, are reported recent instances of elephants being run on peaceful assemblies and assaults made on peasant leaders.

Among organisations, which were declared illegal during the civil disobedience movement and continue to remain so, are several Congress Committees, Volunteer Crops, Students and Youth Unions. No definite reasons are ever advanced in support of the continuance of the ban, except that it is not in the interests of public peace to disclose them. In the North Western Frontier Province and in parts of Bengal, no political work of any kind is possible. The permanent menace and frequent resort to aerial attacks on the civil population, officially known as war-like tribes, have completely crippled and paralysed the political life of the Frontier Province.

During the year 1936, enormous suppression of civil liberties has taken place in the country and there are a number of 'affairs' as great as those of Dreyfus and Tom Mooney to convulse the conscience of the nation. In the beginning of the year, Subhas Chandra Bose was arrested immediately he set his foot on Indian soil and has since been interned in the remote village of Kurseong. Despite repeated demands, the Government refuses to bring him before an open and free court of law. In the last sessions of the Central Legislature, the Government was asked if they shirked the trial, as they had no evidence to which, the Home Member made the eternally silly reply that an open trial was not desirable in the public interest The cry of public interest has become a convenient smoke-screen under which the Executive lightly tampers with the personal liberties of the people. It accuses Subhas Chandra Bose of association with terrorist activities and holds him up as an efficient organiser. The people accept that Bose is an

efficient organiser in the cause of the Congress and Indian freedom and suspect that to be the real reason of why the Government charges him with terrorist associations. "Subhas Chandra Bose is an undesirable person and, whether a particular charge against him stands or not, he ought to be where he is," seems to resemble closely the reasoning of the Californian editor on Tom Mooney. In a similar manner, declared communists and labour workers, who miss no chance of condemning terrorism, have fallen a prey to the charge of terrorist associations and so the punishment of detention. Muzaffar Ahmed, the Merrut case prisoner, came under the clutches of this law and Abdul Halim is still languishing away in prison.

Khan Abdul Ghaffar Khan was, immediately upon his release on August 1, after serving out a two years' sentence, served with orders not to enter the jurisdiction of the Punjab and the Frontier Provinces. The Frontier Government is satisfied that there are reasonable and sufficient grounds for believing that Ghaffar Khan has "acted in a manner prejudicial to the public tranquillity." The Punjab Government prefers to be non-committal and vague and so "has reasonable grounds for believing that Khan Abdul Ghaffar Khan . . . has acted or is about to act in a manner prejudicial to the public safety or peace . . . ." M.R. Masani on his arrival in Lahore on Sepetember 4, was served with an externment order for precisely the same reasons. Khan Abdul Ghaffar Khan is a member of the Congress Working Committee and M. R. Masani the General Secretary of Congress Socialist Party, which are both open and legal organisations, and it is difficult to understand how the Punjab Government could so definitely speculate on other probable activities.

Three recent cases of alleged suciede amongst the Detenus of Bengal, each in September, October and November, have again brought their deplorable condition in painful prominence. Poet Rabindranath Tagore, President of the Indian Civil Liberties Union, in urging a public enquiry says, "for many years Bengal has endured the agony of seeing thousands of her sons and daughters confined and crushed in detention camps without even the semblance of a trial. Their lives have been ruined, their families broken up, and the shadow of unending suffering has lain heavily over the province and over India." Naba Jiban Ghosh, one of the detenus who have committed suicide, belonged to a family which has suffered a particular and rather vengeful repression.

Binoy Jiban Ghosh, an elder brother, was a Professor of History in the Midnapur College for three years, when he was summarily dismissed from his services in October, 1933. Nirmal Jiban Ghosh, another brother, was excuted in connection with the Burge murder case in October, 1934. Yet another brother, Joyti Jiban Ghosh, has been under detention since April, 1932.

In answer to a question in the House of Commons, it was known that Parmanand must continue to be a prisoner, as he had not reformed sufficiently. Parmanand was arrested at Lahore on 22nd February 1915, and has now been 21 years in prison. Parmanand is one of the 62 who were arrested in connection with what is known as the First Lahore Conspiracy Case. 43 of these were sentenced to transporation for life and 8 who did not appeal for mercy were hanged. On the occasion of the amnesty, in December 1919, 28 of these were released and the prison authorities did not recommend the case of the rest. Out of the 15, who continued to be imprisoned, 14 were released in different years between 1925 and 1929 Parmanand alone continues to be a prisoner, though the sentence of transportation for life is usually commuted after the expiry of twenty years.

Jyotish Chandra Chakravarty was on the countless little men of Calcutta, when he had a case of cholera in his house. He went out in the early hours to fetch some medicines. The suspicion of the police was as usual lightly, awakened and Chakravarty was clapped in the police prison. Not all his remonstrances were of any avail to him and his child died. A departmental enquiry was later ordered. The 8th of July was no extraordinary day in the history of administration of laws in Bengal. It is only with a view to show what any day has in store for the people that relevant clippings of Calcutta papers of that date are here reproduced . . . . Miss Lilavati Nag M A., detenu since December 1931, who was transferred from the Midnapur jail to the Dacca jail in order that she may stay three hours daily with her parents for a period of two weeks, has been sent back to the Midnapur jail. . . . Manoranjan Guha of the district of Backerganj, who was recently released from the Andamans after serving out his sentence of 4 years' rigorous imprisonment, has been interned at Pirganj in the district of Midnapur . . . . Soumyendranath Tagore was sentenced to one year's rigorous imprisonment for a speech delivered on the 'Subhas Chandra Bose Day', organised in protest of detention without trial.

In the course of his judgment, the magistrate said, "the language used is well-calculated to excite and promoted disaffection." . . . Surya Kumar Bhattacharya, formerly a teacher of a High English school, is appointed a peripatetic lecturer in the district of Noakhali. He tours the district and delivers speeches on the evils of terrorism, unemployment and agricultural and industrial enterprises. It requires no vivid imagination to picture the nature of this man's loyalist propaganda. . . . The High Court of Clacutta rejected application of detenu Broja Madab Das, who was sentenced to one year's rigorous imprisonment by a lower court. The charge against him was that, in contravention of the order served upon him, he was found mixing or conversing with another detenu Kshitish Chandra Chakravarty on 20th October, 1935 . . . . Counsel for 65 accused charged with rioting in the Hoogly Jute Mills challenged the statement made by the Under-Secretary of State for India in the Commons which, he said, was based on the false and inaccurate message of Reuter's agency. He objected to inaccurate statement of facts of a case which was subjudice (a total sentence of nearly 20 years has since been awarded in this case.) . . . . The Kotwali police aided three houses in Barisal and searched for prescribed literature. Nothing incriminating was found and no arrest was made.

It is obvious that to talk of the libery of democratic control over the Government in this country is idle. Aside of the neglect with which resolutions of the Central Legislature are treated the last sessions will bs remembered for the number of adjournment motions that were disallowed by the Viceroy. Despite assurances to the contrary, official interference with elections under the New Government of India Act is continuing in a number of ways. Candidates are disqualified from contesting the election on the ground of their conviction for a period of more than a year. Circulars have been unearthed which instruct district and police officers to keep a close watch over the candidates in their area and to help defeat of congress candidate. In United Provinces, Frontier Provinces and Madras, a number of meetings has been banned under one law or the other.

So all manner of violations of civil liberties take place. The law is repressive and loose. Justice is severe. The executive acts on speculation. Police excesses and manifold. Private violence is permitted. And none of the liberties is safe.

We may here remember the reasons given by the American Union for the repressive regime in the American colonies. They could as well be applied to the repressive administration in India. British commercial and capital interests have penetrated into the plantations, railways, jute and textile industry, inland navigation and the like and, so, the right to organise a strike, particularly of the industrial workers, is permanently attacked. The administration is actuated by the Indian civilian mentality, which is as bad as the American navy mentality, and carried on by subordinate executive and police officers, who are worse. The Indian freedom movement has entered the stage of frontal opposition to British Imperialism, which can now have but scant regards for the liberities of the people. The increasing poverty and humiliation of the people motivates the nationalist movement, as never before. Where the yearning for an alternative society and unouth promising condemnation of the existing order. The yearning and the condemnation are met with arrests and bans.

There can be no talk, therefore, of a voluntary relaxation of the repressive regime in this country. The police state has come to stay. There is a show of releasing some detenus, mostly on conditions, or training them in industrial centres, but the heavy hand of fresh convictions and detentions, internments and externments knows no rest. Efforts of the Congress and other individuals to enquire into the working of repressive laws have come under the ban of the Government. The Law courts acquit but the executive contains, and so the seeming liberality of justice is findly offset by executive fiats. Only an insistent demand of the people for their civil liberties and an agitation to curtail State-authority can bring about the relaxation of the repressive regime in this country.

India lives today under the shadow of tyranny and what is worse, fear of tyranny.

3

INDIA'S STAND

RAMMANOHAR LOHIA

The Indian people are capable of making good use of freedom. They do not need outside assistance to govern themselves and to live in peace and happiness Interested advocacy of foreign rulers denies the ability of the Indian people to face unaided their several problems. Some of these problems are undoubtedly real and difficult but the mischief does not consist in their power to do harm to Free India. It consists in the delay that these problems are causing in the advent of Indian freedom. Free India of the future need have few worries but India struggling to be free is indeed troubled at questions of religious groups, princes and the like. This is a strange situation but not difficult to explain. Foreign rule has found its social base in these questions and problems. The foreign ownership of India must go.

The Indian people are working and fighting to regain their lost sovereignty. They will not share their sovereignty with foreign agents. What shape they give their freedom when they acquire it, what sovereign laws of social order they erect, what house they build for themselves to live in will be the outcome of their own uninterfered decision and taste. The Indian people will be their own architects and masons and owners and dwellers. This has been the Congress position before and since Mahatma Gandhi met Viceroy Linlithgow in the first week of February. It could not be better stated than when Mahatma Gandhi said after the meeting that "The vital difference between the Congress demand and the

Viceroy's offer consists in the fact that the Viceroy's offer contemplates final determination of India's destiny by the British Government, whereas the Congress position is that the test of real freedom consists in the people of India determining their own destiny without outside interference."

There seems to be hardly a doubt that the position here contemplated is one of complete independence. The future of India will be determined not by the British Parliament but by the Indian people. On second thoughts, however, a question arises. Will the contemplated future mean severance of the British connection ? The answer admits the theory of severance but is non-committal regarding the practice. Insofar as the Indian people are proclaimed the sovereign authority in the country. they undoubtedly have the right to secede from the British Empire but they may choose not to exercise that right. This distinction between latent and actual secession is of great importance, not alone from the sentimental angle. If sentiment persuades me to refuse recognition to a person and a foreigner at that, as my king and his flag, that itself is vital enough but something more is involved. With the distinction between latent and actual severance of the British connection is bound up a whole complex of social and economic relationships. If India does not actually sever the British connection but contents herself with the right to do so, the wide net of her social and economic ties with Britain continues to enmesh her although loosened and at places torn.

The position, therefore, of Mahatma Gandhi and the Congress with regard to these social and economic ties decides whether what they want for India is complete independence. At first arises the question of economic interests of Britain in India. They are of various types. Ranging from a half share and more in the Public Debt to the high salaries in India and pensions and government purchases in Britain, they cover the wide area of private investments in exchange-banking, shipping, factories, teaplantations and the like. In regard to these imperialist interests and their confiscation by Free India, Gandhiji says, "There would be as there should be provision for reasonable compensation for any existing interests which are legitimate and not harmful to the nation." There would be some puckering of eyebrows at this principle. Imperialists would dread it and imagine all manner of wily coils with which Free India will strangle their interests declaring most of them, if

not all, illegitimate and harmful to the nation. Immature radicals would be scared out of their wits by the desire of Gandhiji to give compensation to any manner of British interest and scent in it a general lowering of the flag. What then is this principle of Gandhiji with regard to British interests ?

First, illegitimate interests and those harmful to the nation must go. There is no provision for their compensation. The Public Debt is an illustration. The Congress accepted the view years ago that this British interest is illegitimate and harmful to the nation. It is willing to present its case before an international tribunal. Free India might decide that some other British interests besides the Public Debt are illegitimate and be ready similarly to present her evidence. It is clear, therefore, that the Congress wants that part of the economic tie with Britain which is illegitimate to break completely, and there is to be no compensation. Secondly, such British interests as can be proved to be legitimate and not harmful to the nation may be allowed to exist, and, if they are to be confiscated, reasonable compensation may be granted. I may here be permitted to express an opinion which I hold in common with thousands of my countrymen. There is no single legitimate British interest. Englishmen may be permitted to live in India and work, if they are competent, as clerks and technicians, bereft of their ownership over tea-plantations and factories which must under Free India vest in the nation as a whole. The capital investments of Englishmen in India have been paid back scores of time over and more in the shape of dividends and these investments and dividends have not all been legitimate. Free India may confiscate these investments without any pricks of conscience. The Congress might itself adopt this view on closer scrutiny or we might change ours. But, what heppens, the distinction which Gandhiji draws between legitimate and illegitimate British interests is surely not something which negates the Congress goal of complete independence. It is for us to show that all British interests are illegitimate.

Defence and foreign affairs are another tie which bind India to Britain. In the world today, a nation's economic and cultural life is intimately bound up with its defence and foreign policies. Not only during war years but in the day-to-day life of a country, its foreign relations decide to some extent what its trade should be, how its industries may be regulated and what share of revenues

the Government allots between the military and the social services. All countries including those which enjoy maximum national freedom must to some extent submit their trade, industry and social policies to military needs and foreign affairs. This submission becomes pervasive if a weak country is actually within the orbit of a Great Power. Free India cannot suddenly become a strong country in the military sense and, if she continues to stay within the orbit of British military and foreign policies, her freedom will be greatly limited, even nominal to some extent. She might enjoy the privilege of flying her own flag and maintaining an oversea ambassadorial corps, but that will be all.

Mahatma Gandhi says in regard to defence arrangements of Free India, "So far as defence is concerned surely it will be the primary concern of Free India to make her own agreement. It may well be that India would want elaborate preparation and would want Britain's help if it is given to enable her to do so." This statement is built upon a set of three premises : First, Free India will start with the liability of emasculation and disarmament that a foreign rule had forced upon her people. Should she decide to improve upon her poor defence and come alongside of other peoples, she will have to make a great effort. Secondly, Free India may need foreign assistance to develop her military power and, should Britain be willing to help, India will welcome it. Thirdly, all defence arrangements including the question of help from Britain or any other country will be of India's own decision. It is this third premise which makes it clear that the freedom contemplated by Gandhiji is not the nominal luxury of a flag and a consular corps. The unanswerable argument of soverignty or the complete independence of a nation is said to be its defence and Mahatmaji desires the decision of India regarding her own defence to be supreme. But this principle of supreme national right with regard to defence has to overcome a weakness inherent in India, the weakness caused by foreign rule. India will take some time to build up powerful defences. She will also need outside aid. Till the time, therefore, that India has an efficient army, her sovereignty will be in partial jeopardy and the manner in which she seeks to remove this danger will be decisive. Whether the principle of soverigniy in defence is to be speedily worked out and not merely recognised will depend upon the procedure that Free India employs.

The existing general staff of the Indian army and its Commander-in-Chief and other officers commanding the various divisions must not be allowed to continue into Free India. A political break must necessarily mean a military break. If the people are to know that they have broken with their past and a Free India has emerged, they must know it, among other primary things, through discontinuance of the present military leadership. Even if the services of some officers have to be retained for technical and efficiency reasons or any other unfortunate considerations, it will be best to rename their functions and assign them the capcity of advisers. It will also be instructive to remember a rule of the world-wide game of power politics. Nations hesitate from seeking military and economic assistance at such foreign source as are likely to obtain political domination. A story is told of the Chinese Republic that over ten years ago it asked for tenders on some construction work and, although it got slightly cheaper rates from England and Germany, it chose its orders in Belgium and wisely so. For Belgium was unlikely ever to be able to commit an act of aggression on China. British military advisers in India might be inclined to preserve the past.

We have so far thought alone of elaborate military preparations for the defence of Free India. There is another way. Mahatma Gandhi says, "if I carry India with me, I would want nothing beyond a police force for protection against dacoits and the like." This is high objective and, under certain world conditions which are today more likely then ever before, it is plan sense. To seize these conditions when they arrive and to bring them about is the task more of the Indian than of any other national. There is no reason why the leadership of effective world disarmament should not be assumed by Free India.

It should be clear that Gandhiji and the Congress fully recongnise and accept the principle of sovereignty in defence. Due, however, to the burden of an ignominious past which Free India will carry on her frail shoulders, much will depend on how this principle is actually carried out in practice. The problem of Free India's policies stands on a level with that of defence.

A third tie which binds India to Britain is the role that the Princes play in directly subjugating one-third of the country to imperialist overlordship and in indirect help to imperialist exploitation of the rest. Mahatma Gandhi says in regard to this bond of

slavery. "As Princes they are big vassals of the Crown. I fancy they have no status apart from the crown, certainly not superior to the Crown itself. If the Crown parts with power it today enjoys over the whole of India, naturally, the Princes have to and it should be their pride to look up to the successor of the Crown namely, the people of India for the preservation of their status." No clearer statement is possible. The Princes as agents of Indian slavery are to go. Britan is to be completely denied the use of their service. It is undoubtedly true that a similar service is rendered to the British Empire, wittingly or unwittingly, by certain minority and vested interests. With the distinction that the Congress has drawn between existing minority leaders and genuine minority interests, it has knocked the bottom out of this service.

A review of the position of the Congress and Mahatma Gandhi with regard to the social and economic ties that bind India to Britain shows that they stand for complete independence of the nation and it is but proper that the various implications of this position should be grasped in all detail by Congressmen and the Indian people as whole. Again, the draft resolution for the Ramgarh Congress has authoritatively summed up this position, "Indian freedom cannot exist within the orbit of British Imperialism and Dominion Status or any other Status within the Imperial Structure is wholly inapplicable to India and is not in keeping with the dignity of a great nation and would bind India in many ways to British politics und economic stsucture."

The Indian people are to be their own architects and masons and owners and dwellers. The contours of their structure are also generally indicated. "A Constituent Assembly elected on the basis of adult suffrage" will shape these contours. Whatever other angles and curves and general form the Constituent Assembly might give to India freedom, it can in the nature of things permit no blockages or dark corners for British Imperialism to operate. The Constituent Assembly will consist alone of people' representatives. Knights, rajas and nababs such will have no place in it. This characteristic of the Constituent Assembly is decisive not alone from the viewpoint that internal social justice can be worked out by peoples' representatives and not by vested interests; it is also decisive in regard to the relation between India and Britain and the complete freedom of Free India from foreign control. Peoples' representatives are not only likely to ensure social justice

and economic equality to the masses but also to wrest India completely from foreign domination; knights, rajas and nababs are not only likely to line their own pockets at the expense of the mass of the people but also to ensure to British Imperialists their profits from India. In accepting the programme of a Constituent Assembly of Peoples' representatives, the Congress has proclaimed its adherence to the twin ideals of internal social justice and complete freedom from foreign control. The substance is to obtain its appropriate arm; independence will be shaped in the Constituent Assembly.

Critics and carpers suffer from the habit of putting on wise smiles. In this case they ask that if the Congress position has been one of complete independence before and since the outbreak of the European war, why should a period of six months have been allowed to elapse and why should there still be delay in launching upon a struggle. Surely, the British Government should not be expected to commit political suicide in India and that is what the Congress, with its goal of complete independence and its method of negotiations, wishes. The recurrent readiness therefore of Mahatma Gandhi to converse with the Viceroy shows that the Congress was and is still perhaps willing to compromise with the British Government on something less than independence. This reasoning is absurd. It is undoubtedly true that at the outbreak of the war two ways lay open before the Congress. One was the way of civil disobedience immediately upon the outbreak of war. The other way has actually been followed. It would serve little purpose here to compare the advantages of the two ways, but it may not be forgotten that urgent considerations both of the internal strength and discipline of the Congress and of the external necessity to give the British Government a chance to prove itself guiltless or otherwise prevailed. To suggest that in letting these considerations prevail the Congress was prepared to compromise on something less than independence is to suggest that every exchange of notes and visit of envoys or attempt at legal arbitration and political conciliation between two government is a climb-down. Before it actually goes to war, a government organises itself on war-footing and presents its case before the whole world including the people of the enemy government. It would be senseless to detect in such activity of a government a desire to give in and to surrender the rights of its people. Moreover, the Congress

did not content itself with a mere exchange of notes; it carried out what would be called a diplomatic rupture in the realm of inter-governmental relations. In withdrawing itself from provincial administrations at a fairly early stage of the war, the Congress declared its non-co-operation with the British Government and its war-measures Since then the Congress has been trying to put itself on struggle-footing and to present its case before the world including its own people and the people of Great Britain.

It is remarkable how much the technique of Satyagraha is superior to the way of practical power-politics not only with regard to moral objectives but also in material consequences. Let us note the language of a Satyagrahi, in other words, the language of Mahatma Gandhi, the first civil resister in the realm of political action. The Satyagrahi will not himself close the door on his opponent; he will not hurry he will be ever ready to negotiate and arrive at an honourable compromise; he will do all to change the heart of his opponent; he is ever anxious for peace and, when that is not to be had, his war will be disciplined and nonviolent inviting suffering on himself. With this may be compared the language of the power-politician: He strives for peace with honour; he proclaims his desire to settle all issue through the diplomatic machinery; he wants to remove all outstanding dispute between nations through appeal to institutions like the Court of International Justice and the League of Nations and, in the event of failure he wages war. Forgetting for a moment the vital difference between the Satyagrahi who invites suffering on himself and the power politician who inflicts suffering on others with regard to the genuineness of their motives, attention may be narrowly focussed on a particular type of material consequences. I will state these consequences in the language of the power-politican One's own people is strengthened in its beliefs and the rightness of its cause. It is ready for greater sacrifices; the enemy is exposed in the eyes of the world as a menace to the freedom and peace of mankind; the large block of opinion which has no self-interest in a dispute between two opponents is made, at least, benevolently neutral; even the ranks of the enemy are to some extent neutralised and his opposition is generally weakened.

Such consequences have in some measure flown out of Congress activity during six months of the European war. Let us examine the single much-debated link in the chain of happenings

which began with the Viceroy's speech promising conferment of Dominion Status upon India early after the war, Mahatma Gandhi declared that, although there were snags, he saw germs of settlement in this speech. Then came the meeting between Gandhiji and the Viceroy, the agreement as usual to differ. Mahatma Gandhi once again stated wherein this difference lay and the preceding flow of events enabled him to outline in yet clearer detail and more convincing way the Congress attitude on European interests, princes, minorities and defence. This single link viewed as a whole reveals itself and no explanation of its inner significance should be necessary. Nevertheless, it is instructive to elaborate one aspect. The Viceroy's speech was abandonment of an old position: through its promise of Dominion Status, the British Government took up a new position. This was a change for all the world to see, for the Indian people, the British people and the world at large, and it also expressed a sentiment of the British Government. The Congress Leader at once acknowledged the change in the position of the British Government and saw in it possibilities the might grow and develop into a settlement, naturally, on the basis of the Congress position. In these possibilities existed, well and good, if they did not his meeting with the Viceroy and the subsequent communiques and statements would only enable Gandhiji to demonstrate that the new position of the British Government yet fell far short of the Congress position. Later, Mahatma Gandhi stated that these possibilities did not exist and that he was mistaken in detecting germs of settlement in the Viceroy's offer. Let a point of vital import be not missed. In confessing his own mistake, Gandhiji invited those small sections of the Indian people, larger sections in the world, and, of course, the British people and their Government, who might have likewise appreciated the Viceroy's offer, to feel with him that they were mistaken. This was a case of harmony between the great individual and the big world outside him; Gandhiji first reflected the experience of the world in himself and the imparted his own experience to the outside world. It was indeed unfortunate that this result was achieved at some cost. The highly favourable reaction of Gandhi to the Viceroy's offer added to the indolence of the already indolent and the impatience of the already impatient. Whethere this was due to the comparatively immoderate language of Gandhiji or the comparative immaturity of Congressmen both

of the so-called right and the so-called left is not at all instructive to discover. Gandhiji's language being what it is, Congressmen must learn to know better.

With their exchange of notes and attempts at conciliation with the enemy, the Satyagrahi and the power-politician seek to achieve the identical result of strengthening belief in the rightness of their own cause. The success of the Satyagrahi is in the interest of world freedom and peace while that of the power-politician is restricted to his own narrow good and sometimes not even that. This difference derives from their two mental attitudes and the corresponding action. The Satyagrahi impresses, changes and builds on lasting foundations, because he has faith in the possibilites of man, bears no malice and does not admit to himself the right to use violence even upon his opponent. This is not to say that every civil resister in the Congress today is wholly such. This outstanding superiority over the power-politician is only given to Mahatma Gandhi and, perhaps, a few others. Most of us can only blunder towards this experience, at best, grasp it intellectually, but cannot wholly live it. I am, for instance, and many others like me are impressed as much by the power consequences of Satyagraha as by its moral loftiness and our action is, therefore, somewhere midway between the Satyagrhi's and the power-politician's. It should be remembered that nothing has here been said about the comparative strength of the power-politician and the Satyagrahi in finally overcoming the opponent. The power-politician has serveral times in human history dethroned his opponent from power. The Satyagrahi has yet to prove that he can do so.

So far the effect of Congress activity on non-Congress opinion alone both at home and abroad has been traced. What of its effect on Congressmen's opinions and on the political condition of the country as a whole ?

Between the Congress manifesto on war and the draft resolution for the Ramgarh Congress, there has been a major political action in the shape of withdrawal of Congress Ministries, considerable propagation of Congress views for which many individual Congressmen have been arrested and imprisoned and Mahatma Gandhi has written his weekly articles in the *Harijan* now describing the four pillars of British rule and again detailing the defferences between the Congress and the British Government. With masterly strokes and deft touches, the statue of liberty has been and is still

being carved. An arm is here hewn and an eye is there chiselled. The sculptor has worked before the eyes of the entire Indian people. They have been invited to view the process from its beginning and in all detail. There has been no working in the dark, no secret displomacy. Without parallel in all history, the Congress has tried to be the political educator of the people. The masses have been invited to grasp the meaning of Indian freedom in its different aspects, to recognise the bases of British rule, to learn the elements of India's own foreign policy and to acquire the necessary discipline and non-violence for the struggle of victory over imperialism.

The Congress has attempted to clear up communal issues. Its success in this direction may be seen in the documents of the only important communal organisation of the country. The suggestion here is not that the Congress has succeeded in persuading the Muslim League to adopt a national and reasonable attitude but that the League, not amenable to reason, has however been compelled by events to disclose its true self. The League has presented three demands before the British Government : One, whenever the Indian Constitution is revised, it must be a complete re-examination; two, the new Constitution must receive the approval and sanction of Muslims; three, legitimate Arab demands in Palestine must be met and Indian troops should not be used against Arabs. It is clear that, with the exception of the extra-territorial demand for non-use of Indian troops in Arabia, the Muslim League has nothing positive to contribute either to Indian freedom or to human welfare. The League has nothing to say about how the Indian Constitution should be revised, what should be its basis and when is it to be erected. The League is not interested in the how and when and what of the Indian Constitution; its object is to achieve the right of veto. The demands of the League are thus utterly negative and barren and their danger consists in being a filibuster amendment to the Congress will to overcome imperialism in India and elsewhere.

The League has not felt the need to worry about the issues involved in the present war. Why must humanity suffer the destruction and brutality of recurrent wars ? Can there be a world order from which war and voilence shall have been eliminated ? Has this world order something to do with the destruction of imperialism and fascism and all other forms of slavery of man ? To these and similar questions, the League has no answer. In actual

practice, the two provincial administrations of the Punjab and Bengal, whose chief ministers are members of the League executive, are wholly subordinated to the needs of the British warmachine.

The Congress has been able to make short work of, at least, one scare-rising stunt of the Muslim League. It used to be a favourite refrain of the League that Congress administrations had practised atrocities on Muslims, but there is soft-pedalling now. Not only has the Congress been able to prove the untruth of the atrocity stories and the scare generally, but large sections of Muslims including responsible individuals have also refused to believe the League.

A formula has been evolved to satisfy communal aspirations insofar as they are legitimate. Aside from his right to vote in the election of the Constituent Assembly and, thus, to share in shaping the political and agrarian and industrial structure of the country, every adult Indian belonging to a minority community is also assured in regard of his special rights. No legislation will be enacted in respect of these rights without the consent of representatives of the minority community concerned or, in case of dispute, without the decision of an impartial tribunal. The Congress has evolved this formula in its desire to do all that it can for maintaining the unity of the nation and achieving its freedom. This reasonableness on the part of the Congress may be contrasted with the now favourite refrain of the Muslim League that India is not one nation but two nations and it may be expected that this contrast will not escape the attention of a considerable number of Muslims themselves.

The Congress may face the future of communal relations with comparative comfort. It has done what it could and it will continue to do so. Its declarations and its entire agitation before and since the outbreak of war are there to show to every Muslim that it stands as much for him as for every other Indian; they are there, at least, to convince the reasonable and that is what considerably matters in the growth of freedom. If minority elements should be used to fight the forces of freedom by the creation of communal threst, either because a foreign rule challenged to civil disobedience has no other social base to fall back upon or because a communal leadership wishes to perpetuate itself, the Congress has surely absolved itself of the responsibility.

Events have now reached their climax. On 20th March the sovereign authority of the sovereign institution of the land, the annual session of the Indian National Congress, will state, "The recent pronouncements made on behalf of the British Government in regard to India demonstrate that Great Britain is carrying on the war fundamentally for imperialist ends and for the preservation and strengthening of her Empire, which is based on the exploitation of the people of India, as well as of other Asiatic and African countries. Under these circumstances it is clear that the Congress cannot in any way, directly or indirectly, be party to the war, which means the continuance and perpetuation of this exploitation". The next natural step after the preliminary step of withdrawal of Congress Ministries and the present stage of preparations is also outlined. The Congress will declare, "This preliminary step must naturally be followed by civil disobedience, to which the Congress will unhesitatingly resort as soon as the Congress Organisation is considered fit enough for the purpose, or in case circumstances so shape themselves as to precipitate a crisis". The attention of Congressmen is drawn to Gandhiji's requirement that they must strictly observe discipline and carry out the constructive programme as outlined in the Independence Pledge.

The Congress army is on march. It has been officially told its destination. There is to be civil disobedience for the freedom of the country and the peace of the world. In a way, ever since the outbreak of war, the Congress army knew what was coming. But it knew unofficially. What was in the mind of every soldier and his General, what was also frequently stated by individuals is today the official aim of the Congress. Some men outside the Congress will not be wanting who will see bluster and blare in this declaration of the Congress. It is no use arguing with them. They need only to be told that even a political opponent has written in the columns of a semi-government newspaper that the Congress and Mahatma Gandhi are not known to issue empty threats.

How will Congressmen themselves react to this declaration? The large mass of Congressmen will understand it and work it, but there are two small flanks of the Congress which have somehow lost the ability to grasp things. They revel in side-arguments and the main issue escapes them. They are also able to quote seeming proof for their reasoning. In this case, they will find their seeming

proof in the commentary of Mahatma Gandhi on the Congress resolution who says, "Let it be clearly understood that I cannot be hustled into precipitating the struggle. They err grievously who think that I can ever declare civil disobedience, having been driven thereto by the so-called leftists". These two flanks of the Congress, the so-called rightists and the so-called leftists, for the large mass of Congressmen is neither left nor right in this respect and is wholly united in its preparation for Satyagraha to win India's freedom and secure the world's peace, will hurry to seize upon Gandhiji's commentary to prove their pet theories. And their theories, despite apparent clash, have a singular likeness. They are agreed in feeling that the Congress will not resort to civil disobedience and exult in this feeling. They differ with each other insofar as the one enjoys his exultation in lazy inactivity and the other expresses it through denunciations of the Congress Working Committee.

It is sometimes suggested that class interests are responsible for the blindness of, at least, one of these two Congress flanks. The so-called rightists in the country are said to reflect the bourgeois class interest of the country and, therefore, cannot but throw cold water on efforts of the Congress to wrest through Satyagraha the sovereignty of India. They are excellent at doing nothing and can also take refuge behind the side-arguments of Mahatma Gandhi. All this is perhaps partly right and it is undoubtedly true that, among their mixed motives, class interest also plays a part in the conduct of these artists of lazy inactivity. But may one ask about the conduct of the so-called leftists whose frenzied denunciation of the national leadership only cripples the nation's capacity for action and is as dangerous as inactivity itself. What of their class interest.

I have half a mind to hold Gandhiji responsible for this confussion. He abounds in sinde-arguments and uses a language that gives those who would miss the main issue their chance. He says in his commentary on the Congress resolution, "I cannot, will not, start mass civil disobedience so long as I am not convinced that there is enough discipline and enough non-violence in Congress ranks". The assertion that he will not yet start civil disobedience is, to my mind, only a side-argument in order that Gandhiji might further emphasise the main issue that there must be enough non-violence and enough discipline in Congress ranks and that civil disobedience will follow. It is little use fighting with Gandiji's language; Congressmen must learn to know better.

It may indeed be suggested that the main issue with Congressmen today is to prepare for Satyagraha, to acquire the necessary discipline and non-violence, to carry out the constructive programme and to educate the masses politically. Whether civil disobedience will actually come or not is for the future to disclose, about which there are few absolute certainties, and is not a matter of debate. The Congress has said that it wills civil disobedience and that is important.

The British Government might itself leave us no alternative and, even before the Congress Organisation is considered fit enough for Satyagraya, circumstances might so shape themselves as to precipitate a crisis. Pandit Jawaharlal Nehru says, "For some months past, ever since the resignation of the Congress Ministries, various provincial governments have been picking up and arresting Congressmen for speeches or other activities. Often these activities consist of giving publicity to the congress position in regard to the War. In the Punjab and Bengal such action has been continuous ever since the War began. In Bengal civil liberties have been sought to be completely crushed; in the Punjab hundreds of Congressmen and Ahrars have been imprisoned and the process continues. In the other provinces the process was slower but it has gradually gained momentum. We have said little about this for it is not our way to protest too much. We have held ourselves patiently for the time when action was to be demanded of us That patience did not signify acceptance of this growing attack on us.

> "Now comes the news of Jaiprakash Narayan's arrest in Patna. That is a vital news for Jaiprakash is one of the dearest and most valued of our comrades and his arrest has a deep significance. It mean's the determination of the Government to declare was on the Congress. We do not regret or protest against this as against other arrests. But we realise what it means and we are prepared for it. It is fitting that this arrest should have taken place in the Province were the Congress is going to meet soon for it is that Congress that will give answer to British Imparialism".

Arrests are continually taking place. A stage may soon come when India will once more be a prison-house. Meanwhile, in the happy belief that prison awaits them, Congressmen have to prepare their organisation for Satyagraha.

4

THE MYSTERY OF SIR STAFFORD CRIPPS

RAMMANOHAR LOHIA

The India mission of Sir Stafford Cripps is wrapped up in mystery. Knowing as he did the mind of Indian leaders from previous intimate experience, why did he agree to come out to India with proposals that he should have known were foredoomed to failure ? Why did Churchill send him ? There is also a strange discrepancy between what Cripps said and did upto the moment he felt there was some chance of success and his sayings and doings afterwards. Is there a reason behind this ? What sort of man is Cripps ?

It is not possible today to give documented answers to these questions. But, the poignancy of the situation may not be as keenly felt at some distance of time as by contemporaries and it is possible today to shed light on angles that may get covered up with dusts of forgetfulness. Moreover, the basic necessity of the British State which has spouted and is using both Churchill and Cripps is already discernible and time may only add colour and details to it.

SIR STAFFORD'S SOCIALISM

What sort of man is Cripps ? A single occurrence answers this question better than any other. During the Italo-Ethiopian War, Stafford Cripps outlined his position as a socialist and refused to take ideas in what he said was a struggle between Italian capitalism and Ethiopion feudalism. Such an attitude is revelatory of a man's

general outlook on life as also his level of education and mental maturity. Although a socialist, Cripps showed himself up in this attitude as a European and not as a world-citizen. There are many men in Europe who, inspite of all their sincere professions of racial equality, cannot rid themselves of the white man's burden. It is part of their sub-conscious make-up. If one told them about it, they would honestly feel wronged. But they have such an illimitable faith in the attainments of European civilisation that they must needs be crusaders in the cause of Europe. They are the more modest, the less blood-and-iron and the more arguing species of imperialists. Sir Stafford Cripps is one of them.

Even so, Cripps was a socialist and he ought to have known better. Socialism, however, like any other body of doctrines, is not just one or two straight principles but a mass of interlinked ideas which sometimes, cancel one another and to judge these would require mature thought and a capacity to weigh. Sir Stafford's is a simple mind. He cannot and does not wish to understand complexities. It was enough for him to know that a socialist is opposed to both feudalism and capitalism and that machine—civilisation is better than rural living and, for the moment at least, he was unaware of the other socialist principles of self-determination for nations and decentralisation in economy. Sir Stafford will undoubtedly repudiate to-day his former view of the Italo-Ethiopian war. That again has been due not so much to real understanding as to his later developed love for collective security. Sir Stafford is a man of half-a-dozen straight ideas and he does not suffer from the pale cast of sicklied thought.

LUCK IN RUSSIA

One may wonder how a simple mind could become such a strong force in British politics but one should not. Sir Stafford is in that long line of simple-minded British politicians whose last great representative was Baldwin. Of tolerably good parentage and extremely successful in their own trade or profession, these men possess one great quality, the knack to back the right horse. Sir Stafford backed Russia in time. He did not bring about the Russo-German war, he was at Stalin's court when the war broke-out. He got the laurels. He became a force. With another run of luck, he would have become the most powerful individual in England but,

here, his simplicity of mind stood in the way.

CRIPPS' SOMERSAULTS IN INDIA

Sir Stafford attempted to back India. The horse was a lower. But why should he have tried to swop-horses midstream, why should he have sung praises and later cavilled and carped ? There is no doubt that, during his first ten days in India, Sir Stafford talked business with Congressmen and exchanged pleasantries with the rest. His way of talking business was suave and convincing like a travelling salesman's. We have it on the authority of Maulana Azad that Cripps had agreed to reduce the Viceroy to the position of the British King. During the last five days, his mood changed entirely. He almost told the purchasers to look at the catalogue where everything had been listed and not to worry him about any oral explanations he did not remember having given. His abuse of the Congress was clear and definite; he got out of a difficulty by telling the untruth that Congress was asking power for the Hindus.

SUGGESTED EXPLANATION

Pandit Jawaharlal Nehru has a theory to explain this glaring irrationality of conduct. Jawaharlalji thinks, at least thought on the morrow of the Cripps' failure, that Delhi and Whitehall diehards were frightened at the exceedingly alluring promises which Cripps was making to Indian nationalism and, being his superiors, they pulled Sir Stafford up. This may be true but there is one big drawback in this theory as an explanation of Sir Stafford's conduct. It gives all the power and, therefore, all the blame to the Cabinet in London and the Viceroy in India and reduces Sir Stafford Cripps to being a robot. Sir Stafford is, indeed, part-robot but he is also part-advocated. He advocated the old imperialist plea of communal differences in India rather too well to be a machine. And, if it is suggested that a false sense of loyalty to his country and colleagues impelled Sir Stafford to defame the Indian National Congress at the moment, more than three months have since elapsed and he could have atoned. Even if he would not speak, he could at least have resigned his cabinet post. He is instead attempting to lead the British offensive against Indian nationalism. It is obvious that any theory to explain his strange behaviour must take into account the

workings of his own mind and not merely those of his colleagues and superiors.

Another explanation has been attempted. With the progress of his conversations, Sir Stafford is said to have felt the deadening influence of non-violence upon Congress leaders and their desire, under certain conditions, to make peace with Japan. Cripps himself appears to give this theory his sanction. Apart from the fact that adherence to non-violence and a peace of surrender with aggressers go ill together, there is hardly any doubt that Congress leaders are the least willing in the world to sacrifice idealism to opportunist considerations. That may be due to their being in the opposition; they too may change after they have power. But their present state of mind is indisputably clear and Sir Stafford could not possibly have misread it; they would not seek peace with aggressors. Moreover to suggest that the principle of non-violence stood in any way between Sir Stafford and the Congress Working Committee is to fly in the face of facts. Anybody who studies its resolutions and the utterances of it spokesmen must admit that the Working Committee has in recent months shied from non-violence like an unbroken colt. At times, its pleadings have been so woefully pathetic as if non-violence were a crime. Sir Stafford could not possibly have been so deaf and, shall I add dumb. That Mahatma Gandhi might have insisted with Cripps on the efficacy of non-violence could not have bought about a change in his attitude. He knew of Gandhiji's position before he had embarked on his sugared salesman's talk and his later culminations must, therefore, have their reason elsewhere.

IS THERE REALLY A MYSTERY ?

Mystery is often created by missing the obvious Between the two dissimilar attitudes of Cripps, there was the intervention of the American Johnson. Stafford resented it and he even made chagrined references to it. This was natural. Open American intervention in imperial affairs would touch an Englishman on the raw same as an old man would feel when power started slipping from his hands into those of a viriler set. Aside from being nationally susceptible, Sir Stafford was personally sensitive. After Johnson's intervention, the mission had lost half its charm for Cripps. Even if he had succeeded, he could not have gathered all the plums. The plot was

developing into a two-heroes business. Sir Stafford was both nationally and personally piqued. Even this would not be an entire explanation. His abuses were too strong for a pique. There was some keener disappointment. Moreover, his mission was falling even before America's representative intervened; there was something in this failure itself that caused his bitterness.

THE PREMIER DREAMS

I suggest that the irrationality of Sir Stafford can have only one explanation. This lies in the difference between a dream and a nightmare. While Sir Stafford dreamt, he talked suavely; when the nightmare came, he slightly lost his mental balance. He saw the premiership of the British empire running away. He had hoped to succeed in his mission in India and that he argued, would raise the stock of British radicals and displace the conservative Prime Minister of England. In the failure of his mission, he saw his hopes dashed and there was bitter disappointment and ashy frustration. What is today reasoning by a process of elimination may receive full corraboration, at a not distant date, in the memoirs of the negotiating leaders. It is just possible that Cripps talked about his hopes to Indian leaders, infact, used them as a persuasion. Would not better days lie in store for Indian nationalism with a progressive Prime Minister, could not Cripps have said this ?

The theory is apparently derogatory of Sir Stafford, but not really so, at least, not very much so. At the time that Cripps might have been betraying the trust of his colleagues in India, he perhaps felt that Churchill was behaving likewise, for double-crossing is a frequent practice among realistic colleagues. Again, it will be a half-truth to say that Cripps was inspired by considerations of personal power alone. Power-politics and national politics are inextricably mixed up. In the mind of some very honest politicians, particularly those who do not believe so much in ideas as in the personal touch, resides the gnawing thought that, if only they were at the head, things would go roaringly well. Cripps wanted to be Prime Minister not only for his own sake but for that of England, the British Empire, infact, the whole world. He felt that he had the capacity in him which Churchil obviously does not possess, to breathe progressive activity in the administration of England. He was in dead earnest about succeeding in India so as to gain in

prestige and influence and to be Prime Minister and, with the vastly added power, to manage things better in the British Empire. It was a dream of spiral ascent, where Cripps and the Empire were, in the mind of Sir Stafford, synonymous.

WHY THEN DID HE COME TO INDIA ?

We are now brought to the question of what made Sir Stafford come out to India. It was his indifference to ideas and definite formulations, belief in the personal touch and habit of evolutionary progress. Politicians in free and prosperous countries may talk loose radicalism while in opposition but they also form the habit of alternately walking in and out of the government. Progress is to them more an amorphous movement onwards than a definite and well-formulated advance. They become evolutionary by habit, although they may exhibit occasional radicalism in speeches, and their conception of political improvement is to a large extent change in administrative personnel. Sir Stafford had guessed that Indian leaders would be as wise as he and, human nature being the same all over, would react similarly. That is why, although he may have expected the disapproval of Congress leaders to the formulation of British proposals, he believed that an amorphous talk about revolutionary possibilities and a concrete vision of change in government personnel would finally bring them round. He had not the maturity of experience to see that India was neither free nor prosperous and her nationalist politicians, with the possible exception of Rajagopalachariar, were built on a different pattern. Sri Rajagopalachariar is perhaps the only grand manner politician in India who has the unobjectivity of a free people and the nonchalance of a rich country. The great Congress leaders, howevr, are generally objective enough to realise that, until foreign rule is ended they have little capacity for all else. They are, therefore- hesitant about mere administrative changes. They desire a, revolutionary infusion of strength in their people, for unsupported by it, they feel helpless even in seats of authority. They have not the etherealness of spirit to forget that their country is neither free nor prosperous and they, therefore, demand a definite break from the past, in thought as well as in action. Moreover, it is just possible that the Indian mind is not as capable of vague ideas as the British mind is; it is more thoughtful and less personal. In

any case, the tragedy of Sir Stafford lay in the possesion of a simple honest imperialist mind which is incapable of grasping that men's habits are different and they clash fearfully and, when they do so, bitterness is the outcome.

WHY DID CHURCHILL SEND HIM ?

Was Churchill astute enough to foresee all this when he sent Cripps out ? That would perhaps be overemphasising his ego and underrating his statecrafts. He might indeed have been anxious to show an upstate rival his place but other springs of action appear to have been more dominant. There was some necessaity of the British State which drove Churchill to accept the Cripps mission. In vulgar terms. it was the pressure of nationalist opposition in India and its reflection in the pressure of public opinion in England and among the Allies especially in China and America. These pressures to make sense, must be studied in relation to the basic necessity of the British State.

ENGLAND'S NECESSITY TO MAINTAIN THE EMPIRE

The Empire is England's necessity. Economic and geo-political factors compel England to continue maintaining a far-flung Empire. Glamour and traditional usages and needs of the ruling class have added the weight of the spirit and of history to this compulsion, so that the Empire is today the basis of existence of the British State. Without an Empire, the present population of England cannot be maintained, not even at levels of living lower than the existing ones. The best-planned socialist commonwealth in Britain can not meet this pressure without the riches of an Empire. The existing British State which has peoples the little island to fantastic proportions must either break or hold on to the Empire. Moreover, the apparatus of sea-power was admirably suited to policing the extensive empire of an island which had neither the strength nor the misfortune to seek for near and contiguous expansion on land. This geo-political apparatus and the iudustrial machine have made of the British State essentially the British Empire. What will the factory-worker together with his exploiting master, the trader, the administrator, the seaman and,

above all, the book-writer and the political gentry will do without an Empire ? To all these the Empire instills the blood in their veins. The ruling class in England realises this. Present-day England is coeval with the Empire. To save Britain and to save the Empire are interchangeable terms This is no more jingling of jingo bells. It is the life-cry of the existing British State. Churchill has the lustiest cry of all English children and he is also the supreme exponent, in speech and in action, of the imperial necessity of the British State.

THE NAVY CAN'T DO IT

England's geo-political situation, which gave her until recently an admirably same navy-controlled empire, is now a source of great weakness to her. What distinguishes our century from its predecessor is the remarkable intensity with which political awakening, before confined to Europe, is spreading over all world. The slaves are up. It is easy enough to police a whole continent of sleeping men with an efficient little navy but, when they have bestirred themselves into activity, numbers count. Hundreds of millions of men can no longer be ruled from the coastlines or from a distance of thousonds of miles. The nineteenth was the century of ports and harbours and therefore of the navy; the twentieth is the century of the hinterland and, therefore, of huge land forces which obviously include the air arm. England has an intensely rebellious hinterland in her Empire, her navy is no longer up to it, and she is faced with far vaster land forces of her imperial rivals. She is outnumbered by eaternal foes and is internally threatened by rebellious subject-populations. Her need therefore is, firstly, to appease her freedom demanding subjects and secondly to develop alliances with powers of great land forces.

Cripps' India Mission was an expression of this need. It would be a market-place half-truth to regard the mission as a concession made by Churchill to unwelcome American Chinese pressure or to clamourings among—his own people. These pressures and clamourings are only an outward symptom of what goes far deeper down. If Churchill at all made a concession, it was to this deep-down imperious need of the State to appease a rebellious subject-nation at a time when has geo-political situation had deteriotated when its chief instrument of armed might, the

navy, was no longer able to hold its own against the huge armed quantities of other land-powers.

THEREFORE APPEASEMENT

There are two needs of the British State, to hold on to the Empire as also to appease rebelling populations. These two needs are in no wise contradictory of each other. They may only appear at times to pursue divergent paths. In the ultimate analysis, these two needs are related to one another like a mother to her suckling child, for where is the need to appease a subject-nation if there is to be no empire. The process of appeasement must definitely fall short of the end of the empire. If a subject-nation cannot be satisfied with anything less than the destruction of all foreign rule, basic need of an imperialist State to hold on to the empire at all costs must assert itself. Concessions to a revolting population are only a device to save an empire, when it is in distress. Churchill and Cripps do not differ in their desire to continue the empire; they differ in their emphasis.

BUT WITHIN LIMITS

A State never commits intentioned suicide. To pursue the similie, it is either killed by outside assassins or withers, disrupts and dies through internal decay. Statesmen may differ in their opinion about what is necessary to restore the health of the State and to strengthen it; they are united in obeying the mandate of its basic need. The basic need of the British State is the British Empire. When Mahatma Gandhi wants. British statesmen to give up their empire, this is perhaps expecting too much of a set of people whose free will in politics is rather limited. The significance, however, of Gandhiji's wish lies not so much in its content as in the procedure envisaged. A opponent must in every event be appealed to do the right this, even if he is obviously incapable of it. This gives greater assurance to one's own forces, pleases they neutrals and discomfits the opponent's ranks Such appeals, however, are sometimes misused. There is always a tendency in a revoluting population to be appeased with something less than its entire objective. Cripps' India Mission should have proved, if proof were still needed, that an imperial state never

willingly and wholly gives up its Empire; it only loses its possessions to stronger forces. This elementary observation is however, beyond the grasp of some. To them, Mahatma Gandhi's appeals are a God-sent. They tone down the appeals and continue to wait upon the please of His Majesty's Government for another edition of the Cripps' Mission.

A statesman usually carries many strings to his bow. In the event of one snapping, he is always ready to make use of the second or the third string. As Cripps failed in his appeasement policy, he harped on the communal differences in India. Divide and rule is a permanent string of imperialist policy. It serves two ends It is a propaganda device to seek self-justification, to trap neutrals and no confound the rebelling population. It is also an administrative device to create barriers and to break the will of a revolting nation into several mutually conflicting desires. The obverse of Cripps the appeaser was Cripps the divider and that he played his old imperialist part only too well was due to an overdose of personal frustration and bitterness.

BRITISH DECLARATION

The Draft Declaration of the British Cabinet issued by Sir Stafford Cripps on March 29, 1942, has been described by an Oxford Professor as the Declaration of Indian Independence, No State in history has to-date liquidated its territories unless forced to do so by a foregin conqueror of internally successful revolutionaries. It is indeed true that the British State in India has for some time past been faced with either threat. However, at the time the British made their Declaration of India neither of the threats and eventuated. There was no inescapable compulsion. It was at best a case of prudent foresight, an attempt to forestall events. But no State has ever acted to the point of liquidating a part of itself, and a vital part at that before a threat has actually become a compulsion. Such foresight is unknown It presumes too much. It posits a serenity of prophetic wisdom, which is not given to shrinking States. If the British Draft was nevertheless a Declaration of Indian Independence, British has opened a refreshingly new chapter in the history of political practice.

Refreshing originality is only possible to individuals and

revolting groups and, possibly also, to a newly awakened people and their State. The past weighs too heavily on a State whose continued existence over many years has driven it into an accustomed routine. Such a State has its numerous institutions and their personnel and what is least changeable of all, the devices it has perfected for its rule. These devices are designed to secure the State against foreign invasion and internal rebellion. No State which has had time to perfect its devices of rule can ever completely get rid of them. Its statement may, in a moment of pressing necessity or hopeful idealism, see visions of new world in the future but their current action, like the fluttering of a caged bird, is limited by their existing practices. The past dominates the present in such States and future, at its best is a blurred and in determinate vision. At all events, even the blurred visions of a better future in such a State are severely unrelated to the rigid devices of present that is only a continuation of the past.

FUTURE FREEDOM ASSURED ?

The British Declaration contemplated a future for India. It sought to make this future pleasant. It talked of a treaty between India and Britain which would "cover all necessary matters arising out of the complete transfer of responsibility from British to Indian hands " This description is not equivocal. It seemed to go to the route of the conflict between India and Britain. It foresaw an India not long after cessation of hostilities, which is completely freed from British control. The future is pleasant and there does not appear to be any blurring of outlines. Lest there may be any doubt, it is made clear that the Indian Union will be "in no may subordinate in any aspect of its domestic and external affairs."

There was indeed ample ground for a proud Indian to feel hurt that his Union "shall constitute a Dominion associated with the United Kingdom and other Dominions by a common allegiance to the Crown." But a Declaration made in good-will and not as a result of defeat could not be otherwise. Moreover, the Indian Union was given power "to decide in future its relationship" with the British Empire. Once it was formed, the Indian Union, as Cripps said, would be free to disown the Crown

and act like Canada which "can join the U.S.A. tomorrow if it wants to" Such tomorrows indeed never come and, even if they do, they take decades in arriving. A right admitted is not automatically a right exercised. And the right of separation which has been generously granted by a superior Power to a weaker nation is seldom exercised. Only when a nation, at the end of a successful struggle, wrests rights from its erstwhile rulers does it choose to exercise them.

The economic relationship of India to Britain in the future was modelled more or less on the same lines as the political relationship. Cripps said, "we are not going to make any condition in the Treaty as regards guaranteeing the vested rights of British interests in India" and in respect of expropriation measures he suggested "the Union will be free to take all measures which are open to a sovereign State to take." This was perhaps the most refreshing feature of the Cripps Mission. The British commercial interests in India have ever been a thorn in our flesh. They have always been put up as a minority interest to thwart our economic and political advance. For the first time perhaps have the British made, what is of course only a theoretic admission, that British capital and trade are no tone of India's numerous minorities and that they need not be guaranteed. A theoretic admission, however is not necessarily a practical reality. An Indian Union, which is created through the generous assistance of Britain, will, out of oriental gratefulness refuse to expropriate British interests and, even if it chooses to do so, will not have the necessary strength and international backing to deny compensation. Incidentally, it does not need to be argued that most British interests in India do not deserve compensation.

JURISTIC, NOT REAL FREEDOM

The future Indian union, as contemplated in the British Declaration, was juristically free from British political and economic control. That this juristic freedom might not have been real freedom is inherent in all declarations of independence made by a ruler to be ruled. Old ties either snap suddenly or take wearisome long in loosening. That depends on whether the erstwhile ruled have themselves drafted their own Declaration of Independence or whether their rulers have drafted it for them. The British Declaration

offered India the right to be free economically and politically, and that this right may have taken long in exercising is inherent in all political action where grant and not power have been the motivating forces. No proud people, which is in a hurry to do things. ever accepts declarations from others. The British Declaration granted India the right to be free in fairly clear terms. Apart from the fact that the right to be free is not necessarily actual exercise of freedom. It is also of deciding importance to discover as to whom the British Declaration granted this right. Who was to be the inheritor of British authority in India ? This question would have been unnecessary, had the British declaration talked of India as a single country with comparatively uniform institutions. The Indian people would then have been the inheritors of British authority. How they chose to exercise that authority and what organic institutions they built for themselves would then have been left entirely to the decision of the Indian people. But, the British declaration talks dubiously on India and even this tremendously elementary concept of what is India appears to have more than one meaning. The right to be free is not worth much if it is not clear as to who is to be free.

BALKANISATION OF INDIA

The British Declaration draws two pictures of the future in India, in fact of future India hereself. One picture is of India, whole and united. Another is of India split up into several countries. Amidst such confusion even the great fact of India which has endured for centuries seems to vanish away and its place is taken up by manifold speculation and possibilities. The British Declaration has made of India a speculation. The right to be free was granted not to an existing reality but to a speculative fiction.

It is indeed true that the emphasis in the British Declaration appears to rest on a United India "the object is the creation of a new Indian Union" declares the British Draft. It is not several Indias but one India that is truely contemplated. Should this India come into being, and this appears to have been the object of the British draft there would be no further difficulty about the devolution of power. But, the British objective, almost as soon as it was stated, was subjected to various modifying and altering clauses.

India is split up into four Indias. There is the India of any such British Indian Province which chooses "to retain its present constitutional position," the India of such non-acceding provinces which decide to form a Union of their own, the India of Indian States which may not elect to adhere to the Constitution and finally the dismembered rest of India to form the Indian Union. These were indeed merely possibilities. The British Draft did not view them as certainties. But doubts and uncertainties are great dissolvers of institutions. And here the very existence of a country was doubted. That not all the four Indias appear to be likely events and that some of the doubts are rather remote is no answer to the charge that the base on which all else rests in India, the country itself, was assailed by uncertainties. This cannot but cause an agonising feeling to any one who believes in the destiny of India.

INDIAN STATES

The India of the Indian States was the least remote of the doubts raised in the British Draft. The *Status quo* in the Indian States which is entirely outmoded by the progress of events and whose chief sanction is the British bayonet was guaranteed. The few hundreds rulers of Indian States were given the right to sit in the Constitution-making body as if they were hundred million people. After their nominated representatives had taken part in the deliberations of the proposed Indian Union, they were also free to walk out of it. They were given the right to enter into separate treaties with the British Government in London. Such treaties would necessarily have related to Foreign Policy and Defence. The British Empire had thus reserved to itself the right, in the event that the Princes were willing and they are always willing, to station its troops in several parts of India and move them from one place to another and also to direct the foreign policy of one fourth of our population. The proposed Indian Union would probably have had to guarantee the passage of British troops through its own territories, on roads, rivers and railways, in the event that an Indian State made a request for them Moreover, the internal pattern of living in Indian States and their institutions of political conduct would probably have been very dissimilar from those in the proposed Indian Union; there would have been arbitrary rule, however diluted, functioning alongside of democracy. Apart from

the possibility of intrigues in the interest of reaction this would probably have caused serious friction between different parts of India and invited foreign intervention Whenever the British so chose, they would have been in a position to intimidate the proposed Indian Union through the instrument of the Indian States; it would have been the affirmation in form and denial in substance the right of India to be free.

SECEDING PROVINCES

If the Indian States were the least remote of freedom's enemies in the British Draft, the non-adhering provinces that were given the right to form a Union of their own would have been potentially the most dangerous. The difficulties of intrigue and friction and likely foreign intervention and guaranteed passage of foreign troops would have been there in a more accentuated form. It is indeed true that the contingency of non-adhering provinces was not very likely. Only if sixty per cent of the people's representatives in a province did not vote for adherence to the Indian Union, did the dissenting minority have the right to demand plebiscite. This is not a very unfair proposition. There must be the willing consent of well over half the population in any one area to an organic law, unless the decision is to be made by force. On the persent strength of the distruptive forces in the country, all the provinces would most likely have adhered. Even here there were grave grounds of fear, at least of forced compromises on Free India with British commercial interests, for a handful of Britons, as in Bengal, control over ten per cent of the votes in the deciding Legislature. There was, however, the prospect of united working among the dominant parties in the country, once the national government were allowed to be formed, and that would probably have softened the Muslim League and made it alter out of shape its demand for separation. As against this probability of one Indian Union comprising all the British provinces of India, it must be admitted that the idea of the country's dismemberment has for the first time been given a place, although not a very envious one, in a constitutional draft of authority. There is a possibility that this may feed the agitation for separation. The history of any agitation is the story of growth on successively broadening levels of partial victories or partial suppressions. The British acceptance, however niggardly, of

the idea of India's dismemberment as already been seized upon by disruptioinsts as a victory. Their agitation has reached a level broader than the preceding when the British had not yet made their declaration. The British draft is already and, in certain circumstances, may far more be one of the many causes that will perhaps produce civil strife in India.

PRETEXTS FOR THE POLICY

Why did the British government have to admit the possibility of States and Provinces non-adhering and to give them the right, under certain conditions, to break India into pieces ? There is first the plightedword theory and the British distaste, so it is said, for breach of promise. What contracts they would have violated, if they had not given the non-adherence right to provinces, is hard to discover. The pledge in the British draft that the Treaty between India and Britain "will make provision, in accordance with undertakings given by His Majesty's Government for the protection of racial and religious minorities" was more than adequate. As far as the treaties with Indian States are concerned, they are so obsolete that not to scrap them would show a dishonourable collusion between two contracting partners. In fact, these are not treaties but the command of a superior to an inferior and the bowing and scraping and benignity that follow. In regard to the possible dismemberment of India accepted in the British draft, the plighted word theory is almost entirely a pretext.

There is then the theory of dissenters' revolt. It shall not be merely a rhetorical answer, but one in which the desire and strength of State-building is embedded, if National India were to suggest that dissenters' revolts were Free India's business and not that of the evacuated British. This, however, would not be an academic answer. But then no fool-proof academic enquiry is possible. Much will depend on that intangible and unforeseeable quantity, the temper of the people, when the British have left. It is indeed true that the Princes and a section of Muslims have now and then thereatened dire consequences upon a Free and United India. These threats have produced a certain fear atmosphere. What part of this fear atmosphere is genuine, it is difficult to say; one part, at least, is something on which foreign rule thrives and its supporters fatten. If the second part is more deciding than the

first, Free India need have no fear of dissenters' revolts. It is of course true that Muslim separateness from Indian nationalism, whatever its present assistance to foreign rule, has also some genuine foundation. Even so, Free India alone can give an answer, whether in dismemberment or in coercion, or, what is most likely, in an amicable settlement. The longer this answer is delayed the greater becomes the separateness of identity of the various communities in the country. In any case, Muslim fears could more properly have been treated in that part of the Draft which related to the present settlement to have incorporated them in the picture of Future India was either a grave error of the British of their traditional devices of rule.

The British Draft contains many and divergent outlines of Future India. It is like a bad and blurred photograph. Was the landscape unsteady, or the hand of the photographer shake ? Did his hand tremble on set intent or due to infirmity ? Curiously enough, the answer is in the affirmative to all these questions. All the factors were probably operative at the time the photograph was taken.

ANALYSIS OF BRITISH INTENTIONS

This brings us to the question of British intentions towards India British statesmen, preeminently Sir Stafford Cripps, regard the demonstration of their sincerity's as the greatest success of the British draft. On the face of it, this claim is unfounded; for the right to be free was offered to an indeterminate India which was still in the lap of the gods and nobody could tell what exercise would be made of this right Nevertheless, the British can argue that they had made up their minds that India should be free. True enough, but they had also made up their minds, or would make them up when the time came, for several other things. There are several British intentions towards India, not one it cannot be otherwise Even individuals own a whole ladder of resolves, in fact, several ladders placed side by side. In their loves and hates and money-making and power-pursuit and rest, they possess a whole scale of objectives and, if at the moment they appear to be going up one ladder, let there be an interference; they will jump on the next and yet another one that have been placed alongside. All men do this; the only difference between a good man and a bad

man lies in dignity and being true to oneself.

Sir Stafford Cripps should be the first to admit that a multiplicity of intentions is to be found most in a statesman and, still more so, in a cabinet of statesmen. Leaving aside sordid issues of personal power of which most statesmen are in small or large measure victims their opinions on general issues are in a fluid state and they have got to be so. Take Sir Stafford himself. Let us presume that he wants India to be free. What then ? He wants India to be part of a World Federation, if that is not possible, to be under the British Crown, if that is not possible, to enjoy unhindered sovereignity. He would like India to develop her own industries but he would also want his own people to live in comfort, world trade to increase and national tariffs to be held in check and obstructive British interests in India to be conciliated with concessions that he considers legitimate. He perhaps likes India to develop uniformly democratic institutions but, in the light of what considers practical realities, he would want the country to put up for a few more years with the arbitary rule of the princes. This is all, presuming Sir Stafford is pure as snow, but no man can make that claim. Let us now take Mr. Amery and Mr. Churchill. They probably have the same wants as Sri Stafford; only what is third-stage with him is first-stage with them. Mr. Eden is perhaps half-way between the two types. The Draft Declaration of the British Cabinet was a compromise of all these desires and the varying intensity with which they are held. That is why provision is made in the British Draft for a whole fleet of ladders of resolves placed alongside of each other. If the British seem to be going up the ladder of one Indian Union at the moment, there is no guarantee that with some interference and under changed conditions, they may not jump off to the ladders of princely or disrutionists' India. These then will be the levers whereby, in all sincerity and honour to the pledged word, they will force unsavoury compomises upon Future India.

A state has no intentions; it knows only action and shows tendencies. That is why the intentions of a statesman are fluid and changing. The action of the British State in respect of India has been and continues to be to dominate her; there is, in addition, one tendency, among many others, to appease in a measure the Indian desire for freedom The other tendencies of the British State are past-controlled and serve its need of existence. Almost

throughout the nineteenth century the Indian States were perfected as the shock-absorbers of the wars and revolts of India against Britain and their function continues. During the four decades of the twentieth century, the Indian Muslims were sought to be used as a broad social base for British rule against the rising tide of Indian freedom and unity and British efforts have to an extent succeeded. The use of the Indian States and of minorities is therefore the traditional device of rule of the British. Political devices and instruments tend to acquire, through long use, a life of their own. Even if the British so chose, they could not entirely escape them. And why should they choose to do so. The law of existence forbids them to deny themselves the use of these instruments. The hand of the photographer had shaken on set intent as also through compulsion. In its draft declaration, the British state has unmistakably shown two divergent tendencies of approach to India, Free India as also Unfree India, United India and Disrupted Indias. When the recipient itself was unknown, what was the grant of freedom worth ? Moreover, this freedom could any day be curtailed if not in law then through the use of traditional devices of British rule. It would have been a case very much worse than that of Egypt. Britain and Egypt were in their last treaty given equality of opportunities in the matter of flying over each other's territories, but this was only juristic equality. In actual practice, Egypt had then only forty aeroplanes to Britain's four thousand and she had no possibilities of increasing her air-arm of which Britain has shown herself so rich. India's juristic freedom would have been much worse; it would not only have been limited by her internal resources or civil strife but also subject to the vagaries of any future British statesmen who chose to pursue the regressive trend of the British draft.

WHAT OF THE PRESENT ?

If the future of India as contemplated in the British draft was to this extent past-dominated what of the present ? It should be very much more so and it is. If the progressive trend appears to be more pronounced than the regressive in that part of the British Draft which related to the future, it is the other way about in what was the present settlement. This is in the fitness of things. Statesmen are not so much concerned about the future as with the

tendencies of the present and they arrange these in some sort of an order of preference. The present settlement in the British draft was not likely to further the progressive trend.

DEFENCE OF INDIA

The current arrangements envisaged in the British draft were so briefly sketched out that they were vague. They related principally to the defence of India and the character of the government that was to be and the British meaning was made clear only as the negotiations progressed. In respect of defence, the draft said that the British government "must inevitably bear the responsibility for and retain the control and direction of the Defence of India as part of their world war effort but the task of organising to the full the military, moral and material resources of India must be the responsibility of the Government of India with the co-operation of the peoples of India." This enunciation may do credit to a foreign minister who is arguing the case of his country against another but does not wise to see war between the two. As a clause in a working treaty, it is thoroughly pious and slippery except in one point, the retention of the control and direction of Indian defencs in British hands.

As negotiations progressed the British government tried to put a little more concreteness in its proposals for defence. Indian defence was thenceforth to be the responsibility of two departments, the War department under the British commander-in-chief and the defence department under a representative Indian. Two attempts were made by Sir Stafford to define the functions of the two departments. The earlier attempt sought to give an exhaustive list of the powers and responsibilities of defence department. Thirteen items were listed. Two of these were rather amusing work, the supply to tea and bread and beer and possibly, stiffer drinks to troops and the knitting of woollens our brave soldiers, for the lists said, "all canteen organisation" and, "amenities for, and welfare of troops and, their dependents, including Indian soldiers abroad" and its mnst ha e been a momentary lapse of Sir Stafford that made him forget the rather highly entertaining item of dances and cabarets and songstresses for troops. It was of course not all fun; there was work too. Perhaps the most important and, also the most exacting, work of defence department

lay in five directions; the denial policy, the policy of evacuation from threatened areas, economic warfare, public relations and, of course, demobilisation. Indians had asked for strenous duties and they had now no reason to complain. The "representative Indian" was to be given all the unpleasant business of a war, superintending over the miseries that the war is causing to his people without, of course, having anything to do with the waging of it and the broader policies and, by jingo, he was also to explain to his countrymen as the public relations chief why he was harassing them. The remaining six items were midway between light amusing work, Sir Stafford knits too by way of distraction, and powerless but onerous responsibilities. All told, the Indian Defence Member would have had several faces, a merry spinster, a jolly hotelier, a diplomatist commercial traveller, a stationer washing his hands in invisible soap, a harassed accountant and, above all, a demon of destruction without the power to heal.

When the Working Commtitee showed its lack of humour by rejecting this proposal. Sir Stafford made yet another effort. This time, he defined the functions of the War department. The British War Member would have been responsible for the governmental relations of General Headquarters. Navy Headquarters and Air Headquarters which included as item number one. "examining and sanctioning all proposals emanating from G.H.Q. and A.H.Q." Any further description was entirely superfluous but a State document must, I believe, carry more than one item and so three more heads were added. To enquiries as to what the governmental relations and proposals of the various Headquarters specifically meant, Sir Stafford turned an amazed eye. Why did men ask about the obvious; it is such a nastly habit with some and a source of deep embarrassment. The War Department was to be the War department, that was all.

Whatever chinks in the armour of the British Empire in India might still have been left and, who knows what clever Indian might have attempted to abrogate to himself powers under the plea of "organising to the full" India's military and other resources. were removed by the late revelation that the Government of India would consist of the Viceroy and his executive council answerable to him. The army is the chief obvious instrument of a foreign authority; there is no subtlety about it as about the other devices of foreign rule and it is therefore never transferred, unless after defeat, to

popular control. In reserving to itself the responsibility for and control over the Indian army and the present settlement in the British draft was perfectly clear on this point, the British government behaved to pattern. The natural tendency of the British State to retain India as a possession was here in full, immediate and undisguised operation.

ARMY IS EMPIRE

Sir Stafford does not waste too many words over this tendency. His observation to the Indian National Congress is voluminously laconic : "this defence is, as you know, a paramount duty and responsibility of His Majesty's Government, while unity of Command is essential in the interests of the Allied help to India." The Working Committee was salutingly importunate in asking accommodation for the Indian Defence Member alongside of the British War Member; a quarterberth would have done. I hope this will not happen again. The Working Committee was agreed to leave the entire operational activity of the war to the British and, in regard to general policy-framing, was profuse in its assurances to Sir Stafford that its determination to wage war on the Axis was keener than his. But, the British Cabinet was adamant. It wanted all the concerns of Indian army for itself; operational activity, organisational control and policy-framing. The have surrendered in the immediate present any one of these three items would have meant that the British Cabinet had wholeheartedly accepted at any rate, the idea of liquidating the empire in India. Cabinets seldom accept an idea wholeheartedly and their wholehearted execution of it is still more seldom.

Aside from the obvious desire to retain the Indian empire, there were perhaps other background reasons for the British refusal to surrender in the immediate present any vital concerns of the Indian army. Sir Stafford appears to hint at one. In the interests of the Allied help to India, he wanted unity of command. It is difficult to understand why, if the Allied help to India is disintersted and in furtherance of democracy, the Allied should insist on a British War Member. Was a return expected for help given ? Moreover, there appears to have been some distrust in the British mind about what an Indian War Member might not do even in the midst of the war; his government might choose to follow a policy

divergent from that of the Allies.

THE INDIA GOVERNMENT

The character of the war-government proposed by the British government was not clear at the outset. The British draft spoke of "the immediate and effective participation" of Indian leaders in the counsels of their country and elsewhere. This is a rather loose description almost surely deliberate. It may indicate either a norm unilaterally accepted by the British government or a quasi-legal arrangement between two parties. Sir Stafford's earlier effusions about the Indian Cabinet and the National Government that would have been immediately formed strengthened the view that the arrangement between India and Britain was to be legal, at any rate, quasi-legal. But then this cheerful presaging of a break for India was made at homely chats with our leaders and pressmen; it was only meant to create an atmosphere. There was nothing legal about it. The Indian climate, however is no longer suitable for confidence—men or, if that is too harsh an expression, for charmers of the phrase. Sir Stafford discovered this rather late. But he had nothing to offer except norms and wishes. The legal arrangement were to continue unaltered. The Government of India was to be, as before, the Viceroy and a Council answerable to him. The council would have had no status, legal or otherwise, except what the British representative chose to give it in the background of the normative atmosphere which the draft and Sir Stafford had attempted to create. The only sanction of the council would have been resignation, a fact which Sir Stafford emphasised overmuch. Well could Pandit Jawaharlal, "that is not the way to bring about a settlement."

The relationship between any two countries can be studied best in the tendency of State—behaviour towards one another that is uppermost in the immediate present. The Indian State, if it can at all be so called, was to be a branch of the British State wholly so in legal status and, to a considerable extent, in actual substance. The British draft had tried to vell this relationship with a dubious expression. Sir Stafford in his earlier utterances had tried to phrase it away altogether and it was only when the Congress insisted that the veil was lifted and the powder-and-paint removed. The prolongation of the Congress-Cripps negotiations over two weeks

had its reason not only in the Congress representatives' rather keen desire for a settlement but also in the reluctance with which Cripps agreed to descend from the atmosphere on to solid ground, British statesmen, as any other can be ingratiating sellers of rotten ware.

WHY NO IMMEDIATE TRANSFER OF POWER

Explanations have been offered. The reason why the British Government could not alter the already existing character of the government in India was supposed to have been the impossibility of constitutional changes in the midst of a war. It was well suggested by the Congress President that such an organic law of the most revolutionary character as the Anglo-French Union was proposed by the British cabinet in the midst of a war. In fact, the basic outlines of some of the most enduring or novel constitutions, as in the freedom-seeking United States, Revolutionary France or Spain of the Republic, have been hammered out in the midst of strife and war. Moreover, the Congress was even prepared to wait for a constitutional revision till the end of the war; it would have been content with a convention establishing responsibility to the legislature or the right of the Cabinet to take decisions without interference.

The British answer to the demand for a convention, in the absence of a constitutional law, was that it would introduce an irremovable dictatorship and that the minorities would not accept it. The British are a rather absent-minded people; they can be quite whimsical and unconventional when it suits them but expect others to conform to the strictest legal form. It would have been absolutely no dictatorship and nothing irremovable, if for the year or two that the war may still continue, the British had offered unhindered powers to a composite cabinet of principal Indian leaders, pre-eminently those of the Congress and of the Muslim League. Whatever may be said about the form, a responsible democracy would have come into operation in substance. The danger from such composite cabinets is not one of dictatorship; it lies in overmuch attention to democratic forms at the expense of the democratic effort.

It is difficult to see why the minorities in the country should have denied such composite cabinets the right to take decisions without interference. And yet Mr. Jinnah of the Muslim League

said that if the Congress demand were accepted, the Muslims would we "at the mercy of the Congress rule" This is a bewildering observation. There are only two cogent explanations for it. This observation was made three days after the break-down of the Congress-Cripps negotiations, when the British were loosing out for an argument to sustain them, and the Muslim League, which exists in a mutually obliging relationship with them, came to their rescue. Had the negotiations succeeded and the Congress League government been placed in power, this observation would perhaps have not at all been made. It is indeed possible that the fears of Mr. Jinnah may have been genuine. But one cannot argue about fears that have no basis, remote or near, in form or substance. One can only treat them. Whatever may be the success or otherwise of the Congress way of treating these fears, the British way can only have one of two consequences, disruption of India or her continued bondage.

DECLARATION OF SLAVERY

The character of the war-government proposed in the British draft was of colonial subservience. This was largely due to the basic need of the British State to retain its empire in India, which had to express itself almost unhindered in the immediate arrangements but which could suffer idealist coverings in the visions of the future. There were other background reasons. The British government could not possibly transfer the general direction of war and the control over foreign policy and convenanted services to Indians who might in the midst of the war choose to follow a war-and peace policy different from its own.

The Congress could not have agreed to serve in the proposed war-government, for the immediate tendencies operative in a State are infinitely more decisive than the visions of the future. In is these tendencies and not the visions that make the future It the immediate settlement tended in the direction of colonial subservience, the future was not likely to be very much different. There was perhaps a background reason for the Congress rejection of the British draft. The Working Committee feared the attitude of the Indian people and its symbolisation in their Patriarch. Mahatma Gandhi. This fear helped the Committee not to surrender the basic need of the Indian State that is to be.

Sir Stafford said in his first press conference that the British proposals did not represent a radical coverage of policy; they were 'the natural and logical outcome of what has gone before. All statesmen make such cliche' observations, but in this case, it was nothing but the truth. The immediate settlement was entirely past-dominated. The Viceroy loomed almost as large as before. The Commander-in-Chief was unreduced in his august size. What if the British draft was a declaration of independence in the future to an indeterminate India, it was a declaration of almost unabated slavery in the immediate present and that is what matters.

DRAMA OF STATE ACTION

The British draft and its background and sequel have unrolled a fascinating drama of the interplay of trends in state-action and the intentions of statesman. Viewed at from the angle of its British background, the draft represented an apparent but comparatively empty victory of the appeasement policy over the domination policy of an imperil state, the victory of Cripps over Churchill. Regarded from the viewpoint of its Indian reception, it revealed the irremovable antagonism between a decaying empire-state and an awakened subject-people, the succesful assertiveness of Nehru against Amery. In its fact of armed quantities owned by the British state and their comparative strength in the world, the draft made a partial admission of the inferiority of the navy to land and air forces, the courtsey of Chur-fford to Chiang-Roose velt and Azad-Nehru. From the angle of past-dominated device of rule and the basic need of a empire-state it showed the British insistence of retention of India, the victory of Amery over Nehru and Azad. In the light of the threats and dangers over India's frontiers, the draft and negotiations were indicative of the remoteness of invasion and its yet weekly-felt pressure, the confidence of Wavell and Linlithgow against Hitler and Tojo, who were not near enough in full strength. Looked at from the profile of sequel, they showed unmistakably the inevitable two-facedness of an imperial statesman the appeaser Cripps turning sharply into the divider and reppessor Sir Stafford. The British draft and the ensuring Congress action are showing, in what is perhaps the deciding scene of the drama, the basic needs of two States, the British empire that is and the Indian State that is to be, in mortal combat, the duel between

Churchill and Gandhi. No one can say how soon the duel will end, but its outcome is certain. There is to be no further "post-dated cheque on a bank that is obviously crashing." A new may be attempted by the British State under one pressure another and a part-settlement in cash and a deferred promise on an uncertain bank may still be made. If his countrymen do not pull Mahatma Gandhi away from the combat, he may soon succeed in providing India with a full cash settlement.

5

INDIA ON CHINA

RAMMANOHAR LOHIA

SINO-JAPANESE WAR

China is Semi-colonial

China has a government of her own. She possesses a national army. Her embassies and consulates are to be found in various parts of the world. In short, she possesses what are commonly supposed to be the external and internal attributes of a free sovereign Power. Even so, China is not free; she is at best a semi-colonial power. Her chief coastal towns, like Tientsin, Shanghai and Hongkong, and interior towns, like parts of Peiping, are under foreign control. Foreign garrisons stationed in these concessions are like armies of occupation, which have the support of their navy standing by, and of an air-fleet in the concession itself. China's rivers are completely denationalised, so that not only trade ships but gunboats under foreign flags can go up the river Yang-tze and other rivers till 1500 miles in the interior. China's customs are security to indemnities imposed on her by old Treatics, which also grant foreign gartisions privileges of manoeuvring on purely Chinese soil. These are all distinct attributes of foreign territorial domination. What brings China stili further under imperialist domination is the foreign investments and government loans. The total of British capital invested in China is estimated as Rs. 4,000 million and that of Japanese capital is calculated at Rs. 3,000 million. Likewise, other imperialisms have invested their capital

either in private industry or government loans. So, Japan in the north, Great Britain and France in the southern provinces of Szechuan and Yunnan and these and the United States at the Central Government of Nanking have tried to dictate internal politics through loans. In this manner, both from the viewpoint of economic and financial bondage and of territorial control of vital nerve-centres of national life. China is not a free country.

China's frontiers, on the entire north, border on Soviet Russia; on the west and south, on Tibet and British and French possessions of Burma and Indo-China; and on the entire eastern Pacific coast are faced by Japan and her two colonies of Korea and Formosa and the United States Philippine Islands. This ring of foreign Powers surrounding China is vitally interested in her and exercises great internal control in some form or the other.

Chinese Government and Political Parties

Regional War-lords supported by the feudal gentry and big merchants and foreign money continued to rule parts of China, even after the 1911. Revolution, which established the shortlived Sun Yat Sen Republic. Sun Yat Sen, however, lived to see his Three Principles : (1) Nationalism, (2) Democracy, (3) People's Living embodied in the Government of South-Eastern Kwangtung and Canton became the hope of all-China peasants, workers and students. With the help of Russian military and political advisers, an expedition was planned here in 1926 which, as it proceeded northwards, would suppress the anarchy of war-lords and unify all China under a democracy, put an end to foreign domination and secure people's living by curbing landlords and capitalists and through national reconstruction The expedition succeeded and Nanking became in 1928 the capital of a national Government of China. However, foreign concessions and armies continued and imperialist debts were not repudiated. Few war-lords were deposed and most only owed nominal allegiance to Nanking. Landlords continued their oppressive rule. The Government at Nanking did not achieve what was originally planned : The Three Principles of Sun Yat Sen.

The organisation that planned the northern expedition and sought to embody the Three Principles was the Kouminating (People's Party or the National Revolutionary Party). As the expedition progressed, it soon became clear thrre were three

sections in the Koumintang and they were heading for an internal clash. The Right Wing under the leadership of Chiang Kai-Shek, had sectional support among the people, but was not prepared to forego the support of foreign money or break with the feudal and war-lords. It was this section that won. The Left Koumintang carried on for some time in Central China, but found its real seat in 1931, in the Kwangtung province. It was hostile to Chiang Kai-shek's association with foreign capital and inland oppressors. After the apparent success but real failure of the 1927 nationalist drive, the Communists were suppressed and workers' and peasants' organisations smashed. But they soon established their rule in the province of South-east Kiangsi and, after a recent adventurous march over 8000 miles of territory, the Red Army is now in the north-western province of Shensi, which is the centre of popular resistance and within easy reach of Soviet Russia, through Inner and Outer Mongolia.

The decade until early this year was a period of civil wars, war-lords anarchy and not very successful efforts at national reconstruction. Chiang Kai-Shek wished to unite China by reducing Red China to sub-mission, but, in spite of six military expeditions, did not realise his objective. Meanwhile, the political impulse of democracy and the economic motivation of betterment of the masses was cutting across the overlordship of militarists and feudal gentry and giving to the 450 million folk in isolated villages and provincial towns a common nationalist and progressive outlook. This found its chief expression in the popular cry of resistance to Japan. It appears that the policy of unification of the country through military force that the Nanking Government pursued for a whole decade has now been definitely abandoned for that of unity through democracy and resistance to imperialism. Some sort of a United Front with a better mass basis than before seems now to be in progress.

Japan's Urge to Imperialist Expansion

Like every other nation that developed a strong capitalist class that needed foreign markets for exchange of manufactures with raw meterials and for investments of surplus capital, Japan has during the last 40 years struggled for colonies. Ever since September 1931, when Japan invaded Chinese Manchuria, her urge to imperialist expansion has been expressed through the

Army and in the continental drive against China. The Japanese navy, on the other hand, has preferred the oceanic or southward drive, which has set greater value by the Dutch East Indies, Malaya and Siam. In these areas, Japanese commerce has already made great head way as for example, in the Dutch East Indies the Japanese share in the total imports increased from 1.25 per cent over the pre-War period to 30 pre cent in 1934. At the same time commercial conflict here brings Japan into opener antagonism with Britain, France and Holland. Before the conflict in North China arose, it was anticipated that Japan will increasingly adopt the southward drive of the navy as against the continental drive of the army. However, the actual development has been otherwise.

On the world plane, the drive of Japan against China is a continuation of Italy against Ethiopia. The urges are the same and the interests involved are the same. The economy of the imperilist country deteriorates and political unrest among the masses grows and the danger of war further necessitates the securing of essential raw materials and strategic positions. In 1935, Italy projects her tentacles into Ethopia; in 1937, Japan into China. Aside from the inevitable opposition of the invaded peoples, the interests of other imperialist Powers are involved and there is a singular likeness in the manner of their expression in the two cases.

Conflict in North China

The five northern provinces of Hopei, Shantung, Shansi, Chahar and Suiyuan which make up North China contain a population of 82 million and, though only 9 per cent of the total area of the country including Manchuria, they embrace 18 per cent of its population. North China is among the most populous and fertile parts of China and is also roughly endowed with mineral resources Thus, the total coal reserve of China is estimated at 250,000 million tons and North China alone contains 53.91 per cent of the total. In the mining companies operating here, British and Japanese capital is vitally interested. Whereas Manchuria contains nearly 80 per cent of the total iron are reserve of China, North China possesses another 10 per cent or 123 million tons. The iron ore of North China is of a superior variety. Of the entire textile industry, North China possesses a spindlage of 20 per cent or 1

millon spindles and a loomage of 25 per cent or round 12000 looms; of these Japan owns nearly three-fourths. This will suffiice to show the extent of North China resources and the hold that Japanese and other foreign capital has already obtained over these.

Japan's further advancs from Manchuria into North China was checked at Jehol and, during the last three years she had to content herself with the engineering of an indigenous provincial autonomy movement. Meanwhile, the aggressive freedom movement had affected the students of Peiping and workers and peasants all over and found its focal point in resistance to Japan. Already before the conflict broke out, North China was convulsed by cries of boycott and resistance against Japan. It was in the province of Shensi adjoining the North China province of Shansi, that Ching Kai Shek was held captive in December 1936, and from where the beginnings of a United Front among the Nanking Government, Left Koumintang and, to an extent, the Communists are laid down.

On the night of July 7th, there was some firing between Chinese soldiers and the Japanese who were manoeuvring on the purely Chinese soil of Lukouchiao. The Japanese contend that they had the right to do so according to an old treaty of 36 years ago. It is also difficult to say who exactly started the firing. Nevertheless, the Chinese contend that the bridge of Lukouchiao is strategically very important and gives control over the Peiping-Hankow railway. Japan sought to consolidate its position in North China by controlling this railway and thus cutting of the northern provinces from Central China.

Further progress of the conflict revels the swashbuckling tactics of imperialism. The Japanese demanded on July 17 of the Nanking Government that it should cease all military movements, in other words, leave North China to its fate and that the North China Political Council was competent to arrive at a settlement of the incident. The Nanking Government replied that North China was a part of China, that the army and political affairs of North China could not be interfered with by Japan and that all negotiations and settlement must be entered into diiectly with the Central Government. Japan insisted on division; Nanking insisted on unity.

The progress of the war-fronts has also showed that whether. Japan originally planned it of not, the actual line of advance is along the Peiping-Hankow railways.

Imperialist Rivalries

Britain is the major imperialist Power in the Far East and desires to complete her Singapore Eastern Fleet of 94 vessel by 1940. She is friendly to France in her control of the 23 million Indo-Chinese and to Holland of the 60 million Japanese and Sumatrians. Aside from the domination over the Philippnes and other islands, the United States has extended considerable loans, as for instance two recent Rs. 300 million wheat-and-cotton and aeroplane loans, to the Nanking Government. Britain is of course still more vitally interested in the coastal towns and on the mainland of China. Germany and Italy have also helped the Nanking Government with military advisers and air-pilots, China and the Far East bristle with imperialist rivalries and that is also one reason why China is so much in the news.

Still, Japan's intrusion into China is unwelcome and badly so to these imperialist Powers, but not to the point of war. Japan's defeat means strengtheing of Soviet Russia and her increased association with a strong China. It also means the slipping away of Chinese concession. Malaya, Indo-China and East-Indies from imperialist domination. Imperialist Powers have to choose between attacks on their position by a colleague who has run amuck and a general destruction on the imperialist system itself. And so Britain has learnt to relegate deadly wounds to her ambassador in China to their proper place in the scheme of things, but she has also known how to burst up with righteous wrath and cannon shots to revenge her poor missionaries.

Indian Troops to China and War Danger

Into this graveyard of British, Japanese. American and French bayonets, Indian troops have been sent by the British Government They are apparently intended to defend Indian property and men and incidentally also English property and men. India has naturally enough protested emphatically against this use of her sons. The despatch of Indian troops to China is detestable; it is disgusting firstly, that Indians should be slaughtered on foreign battle-fields for imperialist purposes and, secondly, that India should help tighten the octopus grip of Britain over China.

The colonial peoples themselves have helped in spreading imperialist oppression over the world. The history of our own people bears tragic testimony. The British Empire in India was

built piece by piece; troops from Bengal and Madras defeated those of the United Provinces and together the helped to crush the freedom of the Punjab and Burma. In our first struggle against British rule, Puhjabis and Princes helped Britain to come out victorious. Even in our own day, Indian troops and police are standing guard over British property and consulates in China and other Eastern countries. A people that is aspiring for freedom cannot permit this disgrace.

Were Britain to fight Japan, which is very unlikely, Indian troops, then also, should not fight Britain's battle. In the event of an Anglo-Japanese war, the advantage that might accrue to China from our military assistance to Britain will only be temporary; for, finally, it will only strengthen Britain's hold. India can help China better by freeing herself from British control and, then, rendering her such assistance as she can. India can become, perhaps a more effective partner, in the Mutual Assistance Pact that has recently been signed between Soviet Russia and China.

In like manner, the cry of boycott of Japanese goods as an assistanee to China can have meaning only if it does not result in increased trade of our country with Britain. Imperialism is a whole mighty chain and endeavours to break a link somewhere must not be allowed to strengthen another elsewhere. Again, China suffers from British imperialism almost as much as from the Japanese.

Actually two wars are in progress today, one in China and the other in Spain; and there are numerous other subdued warfronts as in Ethiopia and elsewhere. When these isolated war-fronts will get linked up into a world war, it is difficult to say, but this may not be far off India has made up her mind what she will do when this happens. The Indian National Congress will resist India's participation in a war alongside Britain. The people must prepare for this resistance.

ANXIETIES IN NORTH CHINA

On 2nd June came a news-item from Peiping that the Central Government at Nanking had imposed a ban on the Tientsin-Tokyo air-link. This air service which was to connect North China with Japan was to have been Japanese managed and its inauguration was fixed for 1st June. On the same day appeared news from Tokyo

that a Japanese owned farm in the suburbs of Tientsin was burnt down by the Chinese On 9th June came news from Peiping that 4000 of the civil population in Jehol have risen in rebellion against the Japan-Manchukuo troops. Sino-Japanese relations in regard to North China affairs are steadily deteriorating and anxious times for the preservation of peace in North China are ahead.

Aside from establishing the autonomous East Hopie regime, Japan has been acquiring increasing control ever the economic life of North China. The Japanese semi-Government Oriental Development Company acquired last year 3 Chinese cotton mills of Tientsin. At present the Japenese own a total of 688,000 spindlage, while the Chinese are left with 332,000 spindles. In China as a whole, the Japanese owned 39.29 per cent of the 5 million spindles and 44.86 per cent of the 48000 looms. An example of the Sino-Japanese economic co-operation is to be found in the recently organised Tientsin Electric company. Through a series of manipulations, the Chinese interest in this company was reduced to a mere 25 per cent controlled by the Tientsin municipality and even this capital was borrowed from the Japanese.

China is no longer prepared to stand by and see slice of her territory and her economy go under imperialist control. Coupled with the rising national consciousness in China, the general uneasiness in the Far East has become acuter aad a series of conversations and negotiations are being held between England and Japan. Anxious to secure her empire in the East Great Britain is playing the sedate game of maturer but no less destructive imperialism. Her attitude is best expressed in a recent editorial of the *London Times* : "Britain is fully prepared to recognise the obvious fact of Japan's special position in China, but she cannot view with sympathy attempts to consolidate that position by methods too often employed in the last six years". To that the semi-official Chinese Press replies that the terms "special position" and "spheres of influence" could no longer be applied to China and any understanding with foreign power can only be brought about on the basis of equality and reciprocity. China's attitude it stiff but also adapted to the peculiar exigencies of her situation. In an interview the President of the Chinese Government (Executive Yuan) evaded the question as to whether China will take up the question of Manchuria and he other lost tertitories after the North China question is satisfactorily solved but added that a settlement

of the North China question will definitely improve Sino-Japanese relations.

While China is thus steering a middle course between complete diplomatic rupture with Japan and surrender to her, she is also busy negotiating with other Powers for loans and commercial treaties. Though it was definitely stated that the mission of the Chinese coronation delegate, Dr. H.H Kung, to London did not consist in the raising of a loan in Great Britan, Dr. Kung himself stated that he will welcome cheap foreign credit. In like manner, the special appointment of a Russian officer in China to negotiate a commercial treaty with her is looked upon as something more far-reaching. Simultaneously, Russo-Japanese relations are worsening. The Russo-Japanese Fishery convention was the subject of a serious diplomatic crisis last year and its renewal at the end of this year does not appear to be easy. Frontier incidents are daily increasing and there is a race between the Japanese army concentration in Manchuria and the Far Eastern Red Army of Russia.

The unification of China sustained on the will of her people and not on the bayonets of the army is giving her a new consciousness of power. And, what is more significant, she does not appear to be overreaching herself.

The New Government in Japan

The new government has estimated a budget of 3200 million yen, out of which more than 50 per cent go to armaments, 900 million for the army and 800 million for the navy. At the same time, the then Prime Minister Konoye said on 13th June that the policy of armed force will be abandoned in favour of the pacific economic penetration of North China How this will actually work out, nobody can foretell, but there is a decided climb-down in the swash-buckling tone that Japan is wont to adopt towards China.

It is not yet clear how the Minseito and Seiyukai parliamentary parties will finally react to Konoye. These had agreed upon a joint front and joint campaign to pull down the Hayashi Cabinet. Their joint statement read in part, "At such as hour, those who are holding the helm of the State must have a clear vision of the emergency situation, abide by the will of the Throne and respect the desire of the people in conducting the administration, so as to surmount all difficulties. . . . It is high

time to formulate a lasting scheme on a nation-wide scale for the maintenance of peace and order in East Asia and the promotion through industrial development, defence replenishment, and the improvement of the living standard of the people."

How far the new Cabint will express the oceanic or southward policy of the navy as opposed to the continental drive of the army is not clear, but the navy today is decidedly more popular with the Japanese people than the army. The oceanic drive will embrace Dutch East Indies, British Malaya, French Indo-China and Siam. These territories produce 85 per cent of the world's rubber and 94 per cent of its hemp, possess the largest oil fields in the Far East and abound with iron, ten, suggar and tobacco.

Some facts regarding Japanese position in this part of the world may be noted. From 1 25 per cent over the pre-War period, Japan's share in the Netherlands Indies market jumped to 16.38 per cent in 1931 and 30.36 per cent in 1933. In 1931 Japan exported goods for yen 158,450,525 to the islands, (30 per cent of the total imports of the Dutch East Indies), in exchange for imports valued at yen 63,464,068 (5 per cent of Dutch East Indies exports). A Japanese Lieutenant Commander says in regard to these islands. "It is no exaggeration to say that they constitute the strategical key to Australia, New Zealand, and India, not to mention Singapore." It is said that Holland has retained the islands for two centuries "only by sufferance of Great Britain" and there are rumours of a secret British-Dutch military understanding. The investment of the Royal Dutch Shell Company in the Indies amount to 600,000,000 guilders. Holland has announced an increased war expenditure of 50 million guilders during 1937-38 over 1936, thus bringing the vair budget to 138.9 million guilders. (Rs. 100=67 guilders) . . . . By 1940, the Singapore base with its dry docks and repairing yards—the largest, best equipped and most strongly defended British base east of Suez—will be completed. A new Imperial Eastern Fleet is to be created consisting of a minimum strength of 94 vessels, including 5 battleships and representing a capital outlay of some £ 70,000,000 . . . . Japanese relations with Siam are very cordial and yet Siamese finances are based on a large sterling reserve and Britain dominates the southern end of Burma-Japanese statesmen have assured the world that in the penetration of South-Eastern Asia exclusively peaceful methods will be employed. (From American Foreign Policy Report : Anglo-

Japanese Rivalry in South-east Asia).

JAPAN WANTS CHINA

Japanese capital and trade have made a two-fold thrust during the past ten years. In the east, the Continent of China is the victim. In the south seas expending Japanese trade, owing to imperialisms of Britain, France and Holland, has not yet resulted colonial investments. The Army of Japan has supported the Continental drive, while the Navy has espoused the thrust into the South Seas.

From the political viewpoint the Continental drive has been easier. The opponent here is weak and disorganised. Chinese nationalism has not yet succeded in building up a common organic outlook or a central government of undisputed authority. Chinese capital is still on crutches and armaments are in a similar state. Only the New Beginning was started ten years ago and the spirit of Life and Culture has now seized China.

Japan bore the shame of brown and yellow inferiority much as any other people in Asia. She had luck and the rest of Asia looked up to her as a deliverer and an inspiration. People forgot the basis of that luck. Japanese industry and trade, sense of national glory, army and navy had brought luck and they had to be continually reinforced if this luck was to be maintained. Where could Japanese Industry and capital, army and navy find easy aud continual reinforcements ? Not surely in Indo-China for that would bring Japan into conflict with France or in the East Indies where Holland supported by Britain would fight or in Malaya and other Pacific islands for Britain and United States were preferable as friends. China was the country. The inspiration vanished and Japan launched upon a career of imperialism in the manner of Britain.

Japan struck at Manchuria and after the capture of Jehol, knocked at the five provinces of North China. These provinces are among China's best lands : they are in size only one-tenth of the country but they contain about one-sixth of its population. They are very rich in mineral resources coal and iron and are also great producers of food and commercial crops. About one-fifth of the Chinese textile industry is concentrated here. As granary and investment and source of war materials, North China is of the

greatest value to Japan.

Capital and trade had preceded the land armies and gun-boats. Nearly three-fourths of the textile industry in North China is already owned by Japanese capital. Together with British capital, it has the dominating share in coal and iron mines. The power-house of Tientsin, North China's largest city, is almost entirely Japan-owned. Japan was ready to link by air Peiping and Tientsin to Tokyo as the war in North China broke out. She was also buying up land and settling Japanese farmers.

Before Japan resorted to war she tried other tactics. She encouraged a provincial autonomy movement. The five provinces of North China were slowly to drift away from the Chinese central authority, or in other words to come under the increasing advisory, financial and military control of Japan. The North China provincial autonomy movement was the political counterpart of the Japanese economic penetration.

This movement had obviously no mass basis in the people of North China. Its sole-advocates were the classes created or helped by Japanese capital. These were sections of Chinese merchant-class, administrators, mayors of towns and captains of local militias Whatever little importance they acquired was due not so much to any popular following they had as to the key-positions they held and the weakness of the Chinese central authority.

A change came over China. While, the mass of peasants, workers and students in North China were rebelling against Japanese economic domination, an end of the Chinese internal strife was becoming evident. Through intelligent appreciation of the existing situation and good-will on both sides, Nanking and Red China were coming closer together. There is now one army and one government in the whole of China. China can now direct her unified energies against the Japanese offensive in North China.

The war between China and Japan is expressive of the great Empire-Colony conflict in the entire Pacific area. Should we lose sight of the contours of this larger conflict we will help neither China nor other colonial peoples. Temporary possions may sway us into grievous mistakes, as an otherwise rather intelligent Chinese leader in Burma has been swayed. Writing to us a comprehensive report on the Sino-Japanese war, our Chinese correspondene has given us impressive figures of increasing British and

Dutch armaments in Singapore and East Indies. He takes delight in the increase of British and Dutch arms and considers them a check to Japanese imperialism and so a guarantee of peace. This is short-sighted reasoning and neglects to see the Chinese war in the larger perspective of the Empire-Colony conflict of the Pacific. In this larger Empire-conflict Britain is even more of an imperialist than Japan. How can we delight in British arms ? The lasting help that the colonial people of the East can give to China to throw off their own foreign rules and thus destroy or weaken the stranglehold of Britain and France and such other Powers over China.

CHINA IS CHANGING

In December, 1936, the Head of the Chinese Government General Chiang Kai-Shek, was Kidnapped and held capitive in the city of Sian by his provincial Army-chief General Chang Hsueh-Liang. This incident shook China and threatened to shake the world. The factors of rivalry, ambition, a bankrupt treasury and all that were summoned to explain Chang's conduct, but it soon became clear that Chiang Kai-Khek's arrest was meant to express resentment against the Central Government's policies, both external and internal. Internally, the Central Government at Nanking has for the past seven years followed the policy of unification of China by expeditionary forces and repression and, consequently, it has had little time externally for resistance against Japanese and other imperialisms.

The Sian incident expressed in a dramatic manner China's intense feeling against Japanese imperialism, and whatever its ultimate effect, it led, in February, to the meeting of the Thrid Plenary Session of the Kuomintang to consider the future policy of the Government. The manifesto it has issued lays down the preliminaries for a New Beginning.

China had awakened to new life in 1926 and the Kuomintang (Peoples' Party) became the universally accepted and vitally dominant political organisation. In the province of Kwangtung, South-eastern China, a military expedition was planned, and carried out and this expendition was to unify China, free her from imperialist control and introduce democratic reforms. Soon after the entry of Chiang Kai-Shek with a part of the expeditionary forces into

Shanghai, the Central Government at Nanking discarded the original principle of the Kuomintang and launched on a career of understanding with foreign imperialisms, rupture with Soviet Russia, suppression of workers' and peasants' unions and war on the Chinese Communist Party. The awakening of 1926 had a triumphal progress but ended in utter confusion and internal conflict.

The Kuomintang split and the South-east has since largely been under the control of its left wing. The Communist Party grew brought the province of Kiangsi under its control and formed a Red Army of a hundred throusand strong. In September 1931, began the Japanese thrust into Manchuria and the history of China has since then been an unending tale of territorial usurpations by Japanese imperialism. After Manchuria, the Japanese army cast its eyes upon North China proper. The people rose into a fury as if lashed and the December 9th (1935) Movement based on Peiping students and workers stemmed the Japanes invasion. Chinese nationalism now sees in Japanese imperialism its chief enemy and the centre of popular resistance has shifted from the South-east to the northern provinces of Hopei Shani, Shensi and Suiyuan.

Meanwhile the Red Army has marched from South-east Kiangsi over 8000 miles of territory, into the north-western province of Shensi. It is now again in the centre of popular resistance and within easier reach of Soviet Russia, through Inner and Outer Mongolia.

The February meeting of the Kuomintang took place with this background. Till the Sian incident, the Nanking government was committed to a policy of "internal pacification to precede external resistance," which meant that its war machine was directed against the Red Army. A change in this policy appears to have been recorded. Mr. Wang Ching-wei, Chairman of the Central Political Council, thought that, of the three problems facing the Kuomintang and the nation, the most important was the recovery of lost territories and determined defense of the rest of China. Stabilisation of internal conditions was the second problem and the hope was expressed that the communist suppression campaign may be brought an early end. Promotion of economic reconstruction was emphasised as the third problem.

Conditions were also laid down for reconciliation between the

Nanking government and the communists. : (1) The Red Army has to be abolished as a separate unit and incorporated into the unified command of nations' armed forces. (2) The Central Government is to be supreme and the Soviet republics are to be dissolved. (3) Communist propaganda is to cease and class struggle must be stopped.

It is interesting to compare these conditions with those of the Central Executive Committee of the Chinese Communist Party. The Party stops its armed fight against the National Government and is prepared to bring its territory and army under direct direction of the Central Government and the Military Affairs Commission. The Party also puts an end to the policy of confiscation of land from landlords but demands the determined execution of the joint programme of the anti-Japanese national united front. There is obviously a difference in emphasis but the two sets of demands are capable of yielding a platform of negotiations and ultimate settlement.

The decisions in regard to the positive united front programme of the Kuomintang are not yet known. The proposals of the Communists are known. They demand : (1) speedy concentration of all national forces against Japan and (2) safeguarding of civil liberties, (3) convocation of a National Congress.

The Sian incident may only have dramatised the inner conflict of China but what has followed in its wake is of a very far reaching significance both to China and the world. It is true that the National Government at Nanking has, among its social bases, the support of feudal and bourgeois interests and understanding with foreign imperialisms But it is also true that China has begun to feel the Japanese stripes an its flesh and the Nanking government can only at its peril, neglect the large mass of peasants', workers' students', left Kuomintang and communist opinion in the country.

After a decade of continuing civil war, the February decisions of the Central Executive Committee of the Kuomintang are likely to change the directrate of the Central Government's policy from war on communism to resistance against Japan. Chiang Kai-Shek can already think of railway constructior for economic and defence purposes; in April, he outlined a five years' plan of 8500 kilometres of railways. The four hundred fifty million folk of China with a territory twice as large as that of India is again on the front-line of world anti-imperalism.

THE UNITY OF CHINA

A huge population spread over an equally huge territory is a very natural prey to disunifying tendencies. Still, despite their many languages and religions, codes of Confucius and Buddha gave the Chinese people an essential cultural unity. This unity has expressed itself in many forms in art and thought, and, above all, in living. It was however, unable to form the Chinese nation into a single political community, particularly, when China was brought face to face with the modern industrialised world of Europe. Slice by slice, Chinese territories were transformed into foreign concessions and the general imperialist domination of her entire economy aggravated the political disunity of China. The basis of her agriculture continued to be feudal oppression which expressed itself, in the sphere of administration, through a multitude of rival militarist hordes. Foreign trade created another class of compradores. Chinese middlemen of Shanghai and elsewhere, who grew in political importance. Imperialism feudalism, militarism, compradorism were disunifying factors that pulled the Chinese nation into different directions and they had but a poor economy to rest upon. That China had in 1931. a railway mileage only one-fifth that of India and, in proportion to their respective territories, only one-hundred-thirty-fifth that of England is expressive of the comparative absence of a nationally unified market and of a national economic structure.

Till Dr. Sun Yat Sen expressed the urge of the Chinese people to feel and act as a unity, the suzerainty of the Chinese Emperor over his realms was only nominal. The ruling caste was itself party to the disruption of the country into rival militarist camps and it had so far decayed that it could neither preserve the freedom of China nor restore her to unity. In fact, freedom and unity of the country were, as elsewhere, two facets of the same political task which could now be carried out only through a popular upsurge. A democratic movement of the people was required to crush the disruptive trends of militarism and imperialism and to so reconstruct the people's psychology as to create a United China. Such a movement alone could so model the country's economy as would enable the people to live and progress and withstand the disruptive trends. Dr. Sun Yat Sen's Three Principles of national independence, political democracy and people's living arose, in reality, out

cf one basic principle, the democratic upsurge of the people.

As few other factors in world history, Dr. Sun Yat Sen's Testament and Three Principles have been and are a guide to this ancient people of hoary and continuing traditions in the task of recreating itself.

When the Expeditionary Force of the Kwangtung province in South China started north-words in 1926, on its mission of unifying China in a democracy, a series of struggles of the masses had preceded it and had partially trained the people into resistance to militarism and imperialism. More than the military strength of the Expeditionary Force itself, the open welcome given it by the people of China assured its victory. The speeches and leaflets of the Expedition's propagandists were brought into more frequent use than the bullets of its soldiers. A general feeling of national resurgence spread and the Chinese people looked forward to victory, freedom and unity.

The People's Party, Kouminatang, embodied this national will and was, at the same time, the director of the Expeditionary Force and the organ of the people's struggles. As director of the Expeditionary Force, it trained up an army on the lines of a national militia, a competent General Staff and able Commanders and Generals. As organ of the people's struggles, it organised among the Chinese people the desire in democratic unity and led their struggles against feudal oppression in the villages and imperialist exploitation in the cities. Soviet Russia's help in money and military and general advisers contributed in no small measure to the original strength of the Koumintang and its Expeditionary Force.

Reference has been made elsewhere to the fate of this expedition. Armed forces entered Shanghai under the command of General Chiang Kai-Shek who eventually succeeded in establishing a Central Government in Nanking. The Nanking Government spoke in the name of the Koumintnag. It did not however provide for internal party democracy. A pro-Nanking Executive assumed all power and no provision was made for plenary sessions of the Party Congress at which this Executive and its government could have been compelled to ask for the renewed confidence of the Party. The unity of China that was to have been brought about under the leadership of the Three Principles suffered serious setbacks. The freedom of China was more a juristic appearance and,

though some efforts were made by the Nanking Government to translate it into reality, there were largely unsuccessful. Imperialism conceded in comparatively minor matters such as autonomy in the levying of custom duties on foreign trade but, on the whole, it continued to dominate China both territorially and economically. Through denationalisation of strategic cities known as foreign concessions and international settlements, control over rivers and railways, business investments and government loans, different imperialist Powers maintained their grip on China. During the last ten years of its rule, the Nanking Government has suffered further losses of territory to Japanese imperialism in the shape of Manchuria and Jehol. It has no doubt sought to improve People's Living through improvements in agriculture, transport, currency and education, but these have barely touched a fringe of the Chinese problem. In like manner, a gulf yawns between what was set for in the way of a creative and democratic unity of the Chinese people and what has been attained. Nanking did not permit democratic liberties of expression and association without which a people, with landlords and financiers in its midst, is hardly in a position to express itself creatively. Certain provincial generals nominally owing allegiance to the Central Government were also free to continue the old militarist tradition. While democratic urges which alone could create a United China were held under check by Nanking, Left Koumintang in the South and a moving Red China were brisker in their rate of development. This disparity took such a serious shape that a major part of the energies of the Chinese people has during the last decade been devoted to a series of civil wars between Nanking China and Red China. Distracted China, despite partial advances, remained a disunited China.

Why did the achievements fall so far short of the expectations? Before we enquire into the weaknesses of the Chinese movement itself, we may as well form a background picture of imperialism in China. China has been peculiarly unfortunate in being the battleground of many conflicting imperialisms; Britain, Japan, U.S.A., France, Germany and Italy have all had their individual say in Chinese affairs. Imperialist infrigues and brutality have been far too much of a drag on Chinese national recovery. The story of Japanese imperialism ever since 1931 has been an unending series of wars on Chinese freedom. It has had recourse to brilbery, intimidation and quite often, bombs. It has rested on a modern

and organised economy. In contrast, the weapons of the Chinese were moulded in the shape of a backward and agricultural economy.

The Koumintang was both the director of the Expeditionary Force and the organ of the people's struggles. These are two distinet functions and sometimes a divergence arises between them. The roots of such a divergence are mainly social; the composition of a society, different classes and their mutual relations, is at the back of it. Some classes may want to forge ahead with the people's struggles and, thereby, create a united national will; while others may desire to suppress these struggles and emphasise instead the virtues of diplomacy and tact. Such a conflict of class desires did in fact arise within the Koumintang and the Chinese freedom movement. That eventually a divergence arose between the two functions of the Koumintang was due to this conflict. But, perhaps, this divergence has a significance of its own. Perhaps, the Koumintang was premature in assuming the function of directing an armed force. As the organ of the peoples' struggles, the Koumintang had inevitably to rely on the ideological advance of the masses and their organised peaceful strength. Was the mass of the Chinese people sufficiently advanced, ideologically and organisationally, to master a military machine ? A revolutionary movement that seeks to bring about democracy and unity among a people has to be careful about its own military machines lest they should devour it. The military machine of the Chinese democratic revolutionary movement did in fact strength on the hands of those in the movement and the General Staff who believed more in the virtues of diplomacy and tact than in the faithful carrying out of the revolutionary programme.

The Central Government at Nanking was the work of that wing of the Koumintang which accepted the entry into Shanghai as the end of the nationalist endeavour. Sanghai is not only the principal port but the biggest industrial centre of China. Whoever controls Shanghai controls China's finances and, so, dominates the whole country. The entry into Shanghai, therefore, of armed forces of the Koumintang was natually acclaimed with great national jubilation. However, British, Jappanese and United States gunboats were standing by and ready to strike and several Koumintang generals in the hinterland had only recently learnt to pay homage to popular democracy. The Koumintang section

which cried halt, considered the Expedition a closed chapter. accepted the Shangahi base and desired to build a United China on it got its chance. It sought for recognition by imperialist Powers and got it. It received the assistance of Shanghai compradores, Chinese capitalists and merchants. It secured the benevolent tolerance of feudal militarists in the hinterland. After securing the social base of Chinese capital and feudal elements and saving itself from imperialist gunboats, the Nanking Government attempted to reconstruct China on the lines of the Three Principles.

This proved an impossible task. Nanking was early faced with the question : Is Chinese unity to be born out of bourgeois leadership and feudal alliance or it to be the outcome of the democratic upsurge of the Chinese people ? Nanking's answer left no doubt that, not only would the unity it may achieve be superficial and of ill-defined allies, but the freedom it may secure would be equally halting and hedged. Unity and freedom were two aspects of the same task; only a democratic movement of the Chinese masses could break the shackles of internal feudalism and external imperialism and, thus, achieve unity and freedom.

Nanking thought it wise to adopt the policy of least resistance, of "accept what you have got and build on its base." A section of the Chinese people, however, thought otherwise and felt that, even with the entry into Shanghai, the task of the national revolution was not yet completed. The peasants still suffered feudal oppression, the workers suffered severe exploitation in imperialist and Chinese factories and these and the students still suffered the humiliations of foreign rule. The Chinese Communist Party organised this suffering and gave it expresssion.

Workers of Shanghai and Canton were killed by the thousand in 1927-28 and the peasants fared no better. The unity of China was caught between the truckling of Nanking to feudal elements and the suppression of workers' and peasants' movements.

Nanking however held the trump card. Not only could it rely on Chinese and impearialist finances, but it had the majority of the people on its side, at least, not against it. There was a widespread feeling of victory and that something had been achieved which had to be preserved. A great number of people were willing to accept the entry into Shangahi as the finale of the Northern Expeditionary Force. Their revolutionary enthusiasm felt like celebrating a victory. This was hardly the occasion when the revolt

against Nanking could have spread infection. It could have done so only if there had been adequate clarity among the people as to the various ways in which imperialism exercised its control and drew support from the Chinese vested interests.

It is true that the programme of confiscation of large landed properties was forced on the Communists as a result of the feudal offensive and betryal of the Three Principles But, whatever its justification, this programme served as an irritant. Easily, the impression grew that Communists differed from Nanking in their desire for Socialism and a Soviet-China. It could not as easily be made clear that they differed from Nanking also in their desire for a Free and United China. Left Koumintang should not as it did, have lent its support to Nanking and have, thereby, disrupted the unity of China between the reformisim of Nanking and the revolutionism of the Communists.

During the last ten years, Nanking has engaged in six major battles with Red China. Despite occasional military defeats, Red China has each time eluded the grasp of Nanking. The secret behind it is the incapacity of Nanking to inflict a political defeat on Red China, no matter what its capacity to gain military laurels might be. The political idea behind Red China is invincible. The tormented peasantry welcomes it and aspires for liberation from feudal and militarist oppression. It forms a part of the Red Army. The Communists make it a liberal grant of arms, which Nanking, due to its social structure of big landlords, may not do. The red peasantry supports the regular forces of the Red Army by what is commonly known as "partisan action" against the enemy. Not only is the enemy's rear harassed which makes his advance difficult, but the red peasantry is a reservoir of constant reinforcements to the Red Army. The Unity of China that Communists are working for is that built on the democratic equation of the masses with the State, after a restless elimination of all militarist and feudal interests.

Japanese invasion of North China has brought Nanking, Left Koumintang and Red China together. Reports indicate that where Red China has submitted itself to the unified political and military command of Nanking, the Central Government in turn does not hesitate to put Communists into responsible positions. For the first time in modern history, China is putting up a united people's resistance to imperialism. The Northen Expeditionary Force was

no doubt directed, in one of its end against imperialism but it never came to an actual fight. The battles of Shanghai, 1931-32, were both short-lived and local and were neither preceded nor followed by a united front of the Chinese people. The last six months have written a new page in Chinese history. China is fighting for freedom against imperialism. This fight is united. Competent observers are, therefore, suggesting that even if it came to the worst and China is defeated, out of this defeat will emerge the united national will of the Chinese people for freedom. It will be a "constructive defeat."

Defeat will not be half so bad as desertion. Groups may not be wanting which would like to seize opportunities for peace or compromise with Japan. That will be desertion and will surely lead to a further period of civil wars. No doubt, there is no important group of mass following that today talks of compromise with Japan nor does it seem likely to arise in the future.

In any event, the most likely development appears also to be the most hopeful. Whether defeat or victory, the Chinese people will come out of the war with a deepened content of the Three Principles and a reaffirmed faith. Nationalism will mean removal of all vestiges of territorial and economic control of imperialism. Democracy will mean progressive expression of the will of the people, which will be safeguarded through liberties of expression, association and peaceful action. People's Living will men basic reconstruction of the nation's economy, abolition of landed estates and curtailment of rights of capital.

General Chiang Kai Shek has a majority of the people with him. Commander Chu Teh has proved an expert in "partisan action." There is sure to be a diversity in the rates of development of the two systems that these represent. It is only to be hoped that neither system will permit this diversity to assume such serious proportions as to jeopardise the Unity of China. Nor would this unity have any meaning if it including within its fold feudal militarists and does not make adequate provision for democratic growth.

China like India is discovering unity through national freedom and political democracy. The two peoples have endured in history.

6

INDIANS IN FOREIGN LANDS

RAMMANOHAR LOHIA

Though spread all over the world, the essential concentration of Indian populations overseas has been effected on a belt which runs around the Equator from the North Atlantic over the Indian Ocean to the South Pacific. British Guiana in South America and the neighbouring island of Trinidad contain Indian communities which are nearly one-half of their entire population. The entire South and East of Africa are dotted over by considerable Indian populations. In the three islands of the Indian Ocean, Zanzibar, Mauritius and Ceylon, Indians constitute anywhere between one-tenth and three-fourths of their respective populations. Situated between the Bay of Bengal and the China Sea, they account for nearly one-seventh of the population of Malaya. Beyond Australia, in the Fiji Islands, they are nearly as many as the Fijians themselves. The Equatorial life-line of the British Empire is effectively intersected with vast Indian concentrations.

Army-chiefs and administrators built up Britain's colonial empire and capitalists owned it and worked it. Labour and tradesmen were equally necessary for the economic opening out of this Empire. India supplied these, while Britain produced the Empire's capitalists and administrators In its essentials, the present position of Indians in the British colonies is a continuation of what it has been ever since the first migrations started nearly a hundred years ago. The insult of the indenture system is of course gone as also the feudal serfdom which it entailed. The

Indian is no longer tied to his employer in a system of vicious contracts extending over many years. The indentured labourer has also in a number of cases transformed himself into the small peasant. However, the Indian continues to be the labourer, small peasant and petty trader of Britain's colonial empire. In recent years, he has also risen into the free professional and stray individuals have also come into the ownership of large plantations and factories, Essentially, however, the strength as also the weakness of the Indian position in the British colonies depends upon the labourer, small peasant, petty trader and the free professions. As the difficulties of the Empire and consciousness among the masses are growing, the vast Indian concentrations in the British colonies are rapidly acquiring economic and political importance.

Elsewhere in the Empire and in other foreign countries, Indians number many and have risen into fairly important positions. There is a string of Indian traders which starts from Tokio and Hongkong and extends over Iraq and Gibralter into Panama. There are always a large number of Indian students in the more important world-cities. Some Indians have held and still hold important professional, consular, army and international missions of free foreign countries. Such Indians are however political exiles from home and, though they have brought honour to their country's name, their position is no index to the general political and economic conditions of Overseas Indians.

Overseas Indians have always suffered from a variety of disabilities and have been very much a tragic community. They went out from their country as serfs, labourers and tradesmen, and India, subject herself to foreign domination, was unable to be of any political or economic assistance to them. They are now faced with a danger which almost threatens to wipe them out. This is the danger of the attempt of British Imperialism to achieve structural changes in its colonial economy. The pre-War structure of a multitude of petty tradesmen and small peasants is utterly inadequate to the needs of post-War imperialism that has no further colonial territories to open out. Imperialism must therefore rationalise itself and wipe out the petty tradesmen and peasants. Indians are the direct victims of this new imperialist attack. Elsewhere too, the general increase of nationalist feeling and the inability of India to be of any assistance have caused a certain deterioration of the Indian position,

Any effective resistance to the new imperialist policies will depend on how far Indians overseas are able to grapple with and overcome their own weaknesses. Their individualistic past and sectional division on the basis of their home language and province are their first bane Uprooted from the communal life of home, Overseas Indians have tended to be narrowly individualistic by virtue of their calling of petty trades and small farms. In addition, the different Indian languages, predominantly Hindustani, Tamil and Gujerati, that are spoken among them have created barriers without any inter communication or mutual understanding. These divisions have sometimes degenerated into shabby squabbles, The Hindustani, Tamilian and Gujerati have kept a loof from one another. Increasing enlightenment and the general imperialist attack have created an atmosphere in which those age old divisions have little chance of survival. It should be a first task of Overseas Indians to consolidate and make intensive use of this atmosphere.

There is something tenacious in Indian culture and, despite the distance of thousands of miles, this culture has stuck to our overseas compatriots. Inevitably, the dominant trend of this culture has been religious. This explains the comparatively small number of Overseas Indians who have changed their religion and embraced Christianity instead. To the extent that the religious quality of Indian culture has saved our overseas communities from the strangle-grip of Christianity and, consequently, from the nameless merging into a dull, hybrid and cultureless existence, it has been useful It has however had serious drawbacks. The dividing line between religion and orthodoxy is not always clear and Overseas Indians have lately fallen under a more serious spell of orthodoxy. Hindu and Mohammedan preachers alike, who know little and care to know less about the world in which they live, have in recent years migrated in large numbers to the colonies of Indian concentration. They have not only confirmed their flock in their faiths but have encouraged them to look upon religion as the supreme principle of life. This religion is often a supersittion. From so far off a land like Trinidad, distanced from us by nearly ten thousand miles, the Congress Foreign Department has received a striking illustration of supersitious religion. The Trinidad Hindus seem to have been carrying on an endless controversy as to whether marriages could be performed after dusk according to Vedic rites and they have requested our

co-operation in the solution of this controversy. Such superstitious orthodoxy among Hindus and Mohammendans alike tends to undermine the Indian position in foreign lands and keeps them in a state of ineffective ignorance. Religion becomes their staple mental food. They have little attention and energy for the more engrossing problems of life and culture. Overseas Indians must effect a fundamental change in their mental outlook and shift the emphasis of their thought from religious superstition to more vital cultural problems. It is true that a very large number of Indians in different lands have already liberated themselves from superstitutious beliefs and, in consequence, the task of liberating entire Indian communities overseas should not be difficult.

Overseas Indians have a great possibility of achieving universal literacy and education. Still, their attainments in this field thus far are not very praiseworthy. To an extent the discriminating policies of the various Governments who do not regard the education of Indian children as one of their charges is responsible for this state of affairs. Whatever the attitude of the various Governments. Overseas Indians must and can help themselves to a large extent in the matter of widespread and universal education. They can teach Hindustani, the universal language of India, in their schools and ought to be able to impart to their students a working knowledge of the African and other language that are spoken in their midst.

There is among Overseas Indians a wide lag between the educated classes and the masses. They know little mutual contact. The free professions and the rich maintain a social existence of their own and seldom concern themselves with the problems of the small planter and the labourer. If the free professions and labourers alike are to stay in the hard struggle of the overseas colonies, they have to destroy the barriers that have separated them in the past. Such attempts are already afoot in various colonies and they have to be further intensified.

This takes us to the problem of organisation among Overseas Indians. Due to individualism and divisions of language, education and religious orthodoxy they have been a sadly disorganised community in the past. An effective break with this past has already been made. The new economic policies of British Imperialism in the colonies will further create the pre-conditions of effective organisation among Overseas Indians. In their turn

they must forge ahead with the destruction of various evils from which they have suffered in the past and create solid and well-knit communities. They already possess several newspapers and have formed themselves into associations. These newspapers should give vigorous expression of Indian opinion on several problems as they arise from time to time and become focal centres of engagising their readers into compact bodies. There should be one central organisation in each colony to which all Indians should belong.

The problem of organisation is however not solely racial. Overseas Indians are but one community among many other communities with whom they live in the closest proximity. Together with the dominant imperialist races, particularly the British, African, Asiatic and other oppressed races live in the colonies. Indians cannot therefore live an isolated racial existence. They have to combine with the other races to advance culture and prosperity in their own colonies and further the fight for freedom and democracy throughout the world. Such a united front of races must be given an organisational shape There is for instance the Trade Union of the working class which is easily a united front of all labourers to whatever race they might belong with a view to greater justice and freedom. In like manner, associations of small peasants and small traders irrespective of racial origins may become the united front of all such as wish to resist imperialism exploitation.

The Englishman is everywhere supreme. According to the British High Commissioner in Malaya, the Englishman owns each colony in equal rights with "natives of the soil". In reality, it is the imperialist who is the sole master. Overseas Indians are often counselled to patience and co-operation with the imperialist master. At a farewell dinner to the Indian Agent in South Africa in January 1938, a member of the South African Cabinet advised South African Indians to co-operate with the European. He was concerned to find that of late there had been some attempts in South Africa to form a non-European united front in which Indians were taking a leading part. This may be a matter of concern to the South African European; it is happy news for all such as desire international brotherhood based on equality of races. Insofar as a united front of Indian and other oppressed races, eminently the African is designed to combat European

supremacy and resist imperialist exploitation, it is both necessary and desirable. Neither Indians nor Africans can singly resist their conditions of political and economic inferiority and of cultural backwardness. They must make common cause with each other. Such a united front however is not necessarily a purely racial combination. Europeans, who are themselves exploited or who cannot tolerate the denial of humanity that is a daily practice in the colonies, are welcome to a united front of all races to end slavery. Its new economic policies are a further consolidation of colonial imperialism. The railway may be an improvement upon the boat and the mechanised large plantations upon the backward small plots. But, so long as the motive force of all such improvement is the consolidation of imperialist profits and control, it will inevitably lead to further misery and backwardness. To resist this further deterioration, Overseas Indians should devote themselves especially to achieving a united front of all oppressed races and the exploited masses.

India has often concerned herself with the problems of her overseas children. Mahatma Gandhi started his first Civil Disobedience Movement in South Africa. Ever since, the Indian National Congress has time and again taken up a resolute stand in regard to the political and economic disabilities of Overseas Indians. Aside from general publicity, she has also tried to defend their position through resort to direct action, as, in the instance of boycott of Zanzibar cloves. India can further cement her bonds with her overseas communities. Exchanges visits of cultural contacts may be arranged as also teachers may go out from India to spread education amongst the children of Overseas Indians

Overseas Indians can also make India better known to the world alike in the colonies as also in free countries. They can as the unofficial embassies of the Indian National Congress. Throughout the world they can help in creating a front of freedom and democracy. Already in the cities of the United States, in London, in China and Japan and in other world cities, there are considerable numbers of Indians who are helping to bring India into closer contacts with the progressive world. Such work should be intensified.

Indians are not, as is usually supposed, a stay-at-home and tied-to-the-soil people. For every hundred that stay in the motherland, one Indian seeks his living overseas. These three million

of our stock, who are spread all over the world, are our special concern and our link with the world We must share their sufferings and joys the common. And while we do so, we may not forget that, through concentration of population and trade, they are the predominant community in several British colonies. With each advance in their unity and organisation, a blow is struck for Indian freedom and against imperialism.

GENERAL

Out of nearly 30 lakhs of our countrymen living abroad Ceylon, Malaya, South Africa, Mauritius, Trinidad and Fiji account for nearly 80 per cent. The position of Indians in these countries leaves very much to be desired and appears, in certain cases, to be deteriorating.

The 85,000 Indians in Fiji who account for only a little less than half of the entire population of the island are worried mainly over questions of land tenure, domicile, education and franchise. Twenty thousand of these are of school-going age but only 5,000 are actually in school. They have been deprived of their municipal franchise and, with the recent introduction of the principle of nomination to the lecturers they fear that the possibility of any future improvement is very seriously jeopardised. Even such Indians as are domiciled and permanently settled in Fiji must, it appears, secure a landing permit from the Secretary for Indian affairs on their return from India. The Secretary for Indian affairs is a salaried official of the Fiji Government and seems, together with the Governor of the island, to regard with fear the fact that Indians might profit by the recent discoveries of gold in that island.

Indians do not own land in Fiji. They are tenants either of Fijian owners or of the Colonial Sugar Refining Company. Under a Crown proclamation, all land should belong to the Fijians. Exception has, nevertheless, been made in favour of the Colonial Sugar Refining Company to whom extensive freeholds have been granted Indians can lease land either of the Fijian owners on a twenty-one year contract or of the Company on a ten year contract. It is clear that such tenancies are always very insecure and generally reduce the tenant to a position of intolerable poverty and indebtedness. Moreover, most leases acquired by Indians date

from the period 1917-1920, when the indenture was abolished. In the next few years, these leases will expire and Fijian Indians will be faced with a serious crisis. It is suggested that there is so much unoccupied land in the isiand that the needs of both Indlan Fijians and Fijians can be met.

Ceylon accounts for over 8 lakhs of Indians. In recent years, there has developed an agitation demanding their repatriation and the restriction of unmigration. In fact, a resolution on these lines was tabled in the State Council. As Ceylon wants preferential treatment to her export trade of copra with India, this agitation has not gained ground.

18,000 Indians reside in the island of Jamica. The legality of marriages according to Indian rules is not admitted. This disability appears to be a minor one, unless it is viewed in the proper context of domicile and rights of island-born citizenship.

Indians in New Zealand are deprived if old age pension and workmen's compensation. Workmen's compensation is granted only to nationals of countries with reciprocity.

Indians are spread all over the world and enjoy a very important position, numerically and sometimes economically, in some of the nerve-centres of the British Empire. Their political position, however, is a source of constant anxiety to them and their economic interests are threatened by European encroachment. They are above all anxious to maintain their ties with India.

ZANZIBAR

The Indian has become the convenient scapegoat of the British in Africa. If the African and Arab planter or trader suffers dwindling of his profits due to causes of world depression or imperialist acquisition, it is ultimately the Indian who is held responsible. Lest the Africans and Arabs should know the real makers of their misfortune, investigating Commissions do their Tittle bit towards strengthening British rule by equating the Indian with all the evil deeds of trade-profiteering and money-lending and blood-sucking. In Zanzibar and in various South African legislatures, laws are being enacted whose basis is the assumed guilt of the Indian for the country's poverty.

While these laws thus serve the purpose of retarding Africa's political education and distracting her from the anti-imperialist

movement to petty inter-communal and anti-Indian rivalries, they are also designed to enrich further the British imperialist. In this manner, through the anti-Indian laws, the colonial office of the British Government serves the three-fold purpose of perpetuating the political rule of the British over the colonies, of enriching the British monopolist at the expense of the Indian small trader and of running colonial administrations with the Indian's property.

The Clove Decree of the Zanzibar Government is just such a law. Under this law, the purchase of cloves from growers in distant areas becomes a monopoly of the Clove Growers Association. Despite its name, the Association is not formed of the growers of clove but consists of an advisory body of six or more persons appointed by the Government The Indian trader will have been completely ousted. He is today the sellersupplier of manufacturers and other commodities to the African and Arab growers and buyer-collector of cloves from them. He is also an exporter and creditor.

Together with the land alienation and debt decrees, the clove monopoly is justified on the ground that the Arabs and Africans are being crushed under heavy debts, that their lands have passed under Indian control and that the Indian traders speculation causes great instability of prices. As an answer to these charges, it has been shown that agricultural indebtedness in Zanzibar does not exceed 20 per cent of the assets and that even to this day Indians do not own more than between 12½ per cent 17½ per cent of the total number of clove trees of the land. The Zanzibar clove trees are estimated between thirty and forty lakhs. As for the charge of speculation, it is poined out that the years when the price of clove reached a low level and later rose were also those of great fall of agricultural prices all over the world and of their later recovery.

It is true that the clove growers need assistance of various description. They need to be given proper credit facilities and improved seeds and should be told about the exact requirements of overseas markets. Free storage is desirable. But for all this a monopoly of the clove trade is not at all needed or desirable.

The Indian speculator is likely to have augmented certain unwelcome tendencies of the clove market but the harm that the monopoly will do is very much in excess and is already showing itself. A representation of the Indian Association of Zanzibar

reads :

> "The evil effects of monopoly and the resultant harm to the growers are by now quite patent in the case of clove-stems. Since, the 1st of January, 1936, export of stems from Zanzibar has been prohibited in favour of the Zanzibar distillery and the growers have been obliged to sell them locally to the Clove Growers Association or the distillery at about Re. 1 to 1½ per frasila of 35 lbs. This Association is in a position to say that there is a definite demand of stems at Rs. 3 to 3½ per frasila in foreign markets if it were allowed to be exported."

The Zanzibar distillery was a British concern and is now reported to have been taken over by the Zanzibar Government. In any case, no further evidence of how these laws are designed to enrich either the British monopolist or the colonial government at the expense of African and Arab farmer and Indian trader will be found necessary.

The existence of 15,000 Indians who form nearly 6 per cent of the population of Zanzibar is in danger. The Arabs, Swahilies and other African tribes do not stand to gain by these laws. In the course of a letter the Indian National Association of Zanzibar writes : "The Indian community, far from being a burden, have been of great help to Arabs and Africans and have stood through thick and thin with them." It is to be hoped that the anti-imperialist tie among these will not be allowed to loosen whatever the cost.

The Zanzibar Clove Bill came into operation on 1st August, 1937. As a measure of retaliation, Indian dealers and exporters of clove decided in a conference held on 10th July to resort to passive resistance. No Indian is to apply for buying licenses as an agent of the Clove Grovers Association. No Indian is to engage in the export trade. No Indian is to serve on the advisory board of the Clove Growers Association. It is not difficult to see that this virtually means a hunger-strike of the 15,000 Indians now residing in Zanzibar. They are looking at India with expectation and hope in their eyes. They want the Indian people and merchant to declare a voluntary boycott on Zanzibar cloves. India imports 40 per cent of the entire Zanzibar export of cloves and there is ground that such a step will bring reason to the Zanzibar

Government The Government of India should now impose an embargo; that is an insistent demand. In their determination to resist the Clove Act, the Zanzibar Indians have appealed to the Provincial Governments and Municipalities to assist in the embargo on cloves What the Clove Law will mean to Indian traders is apparent from the latest activities of the Clove Growers Association. This monopolist association is carrying out auction sales of plantation crops under its own authority and arranging to purchase India's gunny bags through European firms in Zanzibar.

While the British Resident in Zanzibar was declaring that the clove monopoly was the arch of the whole settlement, he was also recommending to the Zanzibar council to approve expenditure of over Rs. 30,000 as Zanzibar's contribution to Government of Kenya for coastal defence. Kenya, Uganda and Zanzibar are henceforth to maintain in common a Royal Naval Volunteer Reserve Unit and Coastal Defence Unit at Mombasa, Zanzibar is to contributed 14 per cent towards the total capital and recurrent expenditure to be incurred for the general East African Defence Scheme. The establishment of a naval unit to safeguard the East African coast for the British Empire and the deliberate ousting of Indians from the clove trade of Zanzibar appear to be parts of the same scheme.

Information has reached from Zanzibar that the daily business loss of the Indian community there is anything between Rs. 10,000 and Rs. 15,000. The strike has now lasted for nearly four months and at the most moderate estimate the Indian community of Zanzibar has suffrred a loss of Rs. 10 lakhs. The only hope of Indians in Zanzibar is the effectiveness of our own boycott of Zanzibar cloves. We leran authoritatively that this boycott has already told upon the commercial life of Zanzibar. Some Arab and African cultivators of cloves are regarding the Indian strike with sympathy. Despite a bumper crop of cloves this year the Zanzibar clove monopoly is manoeuvring for a very small harvest. The motive obviously is that with little or no export of cloves to India a good crop might depress prices. This has naturally resulted in considerable resentment among the African and the Arab clove growers. If we can make our boycott of Zanzibar cloves still more effective there is no reason why the combined strength of the African and Arab clove growers and the Indian traders should not bend the Zanzibar Government to an early settlement with the

Indians of Zanzibar.

The action of the Indian National Congress in organising a boycott of Zanzibar cloves has brought our countrymen overseas cheer and hope. It is perhaps for the first time that India has resorted to action in succour of her overseas children. This will give them faith and courage and hope. The Zanzibar Indians have numerous odds to contend against and an uphill fight. Despite their peaceful struggle, some racial antagonism has been aroused and the-Zanzibar Government is accused of encouraging it. Although Zanzibar officers are instructed to "avoid any action likely to give rise to interracial friction" the Government admits, "when opinion is divided on racial lines it is impossible for Government to prevent statemnets being made, even by its own officers, which especially if misunderstood, misinterpreted, misquoted or misrepresented as is occasionally inevitable, may not give offence or arouse resentment between races."

TANGANYIKA AND MAURITUS

Even while the brave resistance of Zanzibar Indians against the British clove monopoly is still continuing, Tanganyika Indians are faced with a similar but more drastic measure. The Tanganyika Government has proposed "An Ordinance to work provision for the encourragement and control of Native Agriculture and Industry and the marketing of the products thereof." Any product of agriculture, horticulture or animal husbandry may be declared a regulated product and Government will then set up a Native Produce Board to control its production and marketing. The Board may give directions as to the method of production, grading and packing and these shall be binding on all producers. The Board may also assume a sole monopoly of purchase. It is obvious that the scope of this proposed measure extends over the entire economic life of Tanganyika. Producers may be effectively controlled and traders completely wiped out of existance. There are over 20,000 Indians in Tanganyika and almost the entire trade of the country is an their hands. Among these are merchants, store keepers, government servants, photographers, typists, electricians, metelworkers and a host of other professions. With the passage of this Ordinance, their existence will be endangered. Some will have to slave under the Board and yet others lose their living and their

place up by British clerks. Indian opposition to this measure is very stiff and the Tanganyika African Welfare Association has also declared its opposition.

Nearer home, in an island of the Indian Ocean, the Indians of Mauritius are in a frightful plight. Even though they from nearly seventy per cent of the entire population, over 2¾ lacs in a total of 4 lacs, Mauritian Indians are either labourers in the French-owned sugar factorios or work on the sugar plantations. They are illiterate, ignorant and disunited. They have taken with them from here the barriers of language and province. A solitary Indian has come into the ownership of three sugar factories and some are moderately rich planters but they do not seem to be very much concerned with the course of their collective destiny. And so the sugar factors owners are left in the enjoyment of their super profits without any resistance.

The worker in the Mauritian factories is ill-paid and overworked; his monthly wage fluctuates between Rs. 20 and Rs. 25. The small planter, who has no other market save that of the factory, is under the virtual serfdom of the Factory-owners Syndicate. Sometimes the millowners refuse to crush his cane and, when they do crush, they frequently exchange 1 ton of sugarcane for 60 to 70 kgs. of sugar, in other words, less than half of the sugar actually extracted. It is believed that there is a systematic drive to seize his lands for non-payment of even the smallest debts and so to form large-scale plantations. In both cases the sufferers are the Indians of Mauritius.

In August 1937, Mauritius saw the unique spectacle of workers' and peasants' strikes. The cry of "Jaya Bharata"—Victory to India—was often heard on their lips. The workers demand increase in wages, right to from trade unions and sanitary working conditions. The peasants demand legal machinery to enforce proper weighments of sugarcane, its compulsory crushing and a fixed rate of payment. These strikes are reported to have resulted in eight deaths and hundreds of arrests. It is unfortunate that some of these deaths should have taken place at the hands of Indian factory owner, who seems to have been angered out of his witsat the spectacle of a strike.

The agitation carried on by the Mauritian Labour Party which admits Indians and Creoles alike to its membership has also revealed the intensely reactionary character of the Mauritian

Constitution. Under the present laws less than 3 per cent of the population is admitted to the franchise, which secures the return to the Council of millowning interests.

The Constitution of Mauritius as behoves a British crown colony, is anti-democratic. The Governor, supported by a wholly nominated Executive Council, rules the Island. The Council of Government, the Island's legislature, consists of 27 members, of whom 17 constitute the nominated official and non-official bloc. The 10 popular members are elected on the basis of the narrow and undemocratic franchise of 9,459 for the whole Island. In addition, the Governor is empowered to enact legislation "considered by him to be essential in interest of good government."

While the Mauritian Constitution is thus an appendage to the authority of the Governor, the citizen's liberties are still more meagre. The Penal Code illegalises strikes and does not permit associations of a more than 15 persons without the consent of the Government. Though a Trade Union Bill was published in the Government Gazette in 1926, it has not yet been discussed in the Council and Mauritian workers have no trade unions. As the crop season was nearing in July 1937 and unrest among small planters and labourers, which eventually led to strikes, was evident, the Government banned all political meetings. A direct result of the absence of the liberties of meeting and association is that, contrary to the communication of the British Government to the International Labour Organisation, the laws on night work, minimum wage and non-employment of children are not applied.

Mauritian Indians have to wage two-fold struggle for democracy and for economic betterment. In fact, the fight for more prosperous conditions and for increased share in the government of the colony are two facts of the same task. Indians, not only in Mauritius but in all British colonies, are faced with this task. In this connexion, a communication of the Creoles President of the Mauritius Labour Party to the Congress Foreign Department deserves attention; "Most British colonies have a large Indian population forming the labouring classes. It appeartains to India who is represented at the International Labour Office of Geneva to take in hand the cause of all the colonies of whatever nationality and to suggest that they should be represented at Geneva. India is the only power represented at Geneva which can stand for the coloured races and see those races

receive their social reforms which are adopted elsewhere. It is India's duty to be the champion of the colonies where so many of her sons live and toil."

Information comes from Ceylon of the desire of the Ceylonese Government to outs Indian cultivators from their lands. In Kandapola, 37 Indian families have been cultivating vegetables for now over 36 years. They have cleared grassy lands, made them fertile and erected dwellings and cattlesheds. There is yet waste land and still the Sinhalese Minister of Agriculture will have the Indians ousted from their living. In like manner, the proposed Village Ordinance seeks to exclude the 700,000 Indian estate labourers from any share in the local self-government of the country.

So, in the east of the African Continent and in the two islands of the Indian Ocean, the economic and political position of Indians is simultaneously attacked. What does this indicate ? Who is to blame ? is it that the Indian is in reality exploiting the African and the Sinhalese and the Mauritian or that he is a distasteful interference to the British in their own pleasant job ? The maintenance of high colonial salaries and increased expenditure on defence and a few more jobs to the British middle class are a first charge on the British colonial office. Monopolics of native produce are formed and attack on Indian traders follows. Imperialism however does not rest there. It must poison the world with enmity and ill-will. It chokes and throttles the economic life of a colony and leaves no scope for expansion nor elbow-room. The stage is set for a Sinhalese Minister. for instance, to follow the line of least resistance and launch a furtile attack on fellow-sufferers. It is also likely that the British colonial office wishes to oust Indians from their present positions in the Empire lest they should become troublesome under Free India.

KENYA AND BRITISH EAST AFRICA Kenya, Uganda and Tanganyika comprise a territory of round 17 lacs sq. kilometres and are, thus, over one-third the size of India. Both as source of raw materials and fields of capital investments, they can be made very productive for the Empire. Tanganyika is only nominally a a mandated territory; for all practical purposes it is a part of British East Africa. A union of customs and posts and telegraphs has already been achieved. The postal stamps from any part of British East Africa fluant a lion surrounded by the names of

Kenya, Uganda and Tanganyika printed in English letters. Coins bear the effigies of the British King.

Aside from the obvious military strategic uses, this close political union of British East Africa is essentially a reflection of the Empire's economic aspirations. British East Africa must now change over from a field of extensive to intensive imperialist exploitation. This change-over has necessitated a common anti-Indian policy in economic organisation.

Kenya and Tanganyika have recently formulated a law for regulation of transport. Under this law, monopoly can be granted to such transport as merits the attention of a paid Board of the Government. Not only motor and bus but also boat transport may be entirely wiped our with an administrative order. This drastic law of the Kenya Government contravenes the report of its own expert appointed in 1936 to enquire into probles of transport. "From its nature there seems very little chance of the Kenya and Uganda railways capturing any large portion of the extensive traffic in local produce which is now being usefully carried by dhows (boats). The Licensing Commission would not therefore find it necessary or desirable to introduce any restriction in the present number or operations of dhows " That the Government should have set aside this recommendations of its own expert and all other considerations of advantage to the African is clearly expressive of its inordinate desire to capitalise the country through railways and other business investments. Indians are the direct victims and Africans will suffer Indirectly.

The Kenya Highlands controversy is no closed and extensive and fertile lands in the country will now be reserved for exclusively European use through an Order-in-Council. Thirty-five years ago, in 1902, the Kenya Government had assured the Indian community that they were "in error in supposing that the Government has any intention of drawing any distinction between Europeans and Indians so far as rights of mining, settling and acquiring lands are concerned." Assurances and promises however cannot hold water against inexorable economic necessities. The Empire today needs large plantations under exclusively European ownership so that its various demands of raw materials, profits on investments and military strategy may be satisfied. The chauvinist leader of the Kenya Defence Force to which no Indian is admitted has already ranted that Kenya Highlands are European and that no interference

either by Kenya Indians or by the Government of India will be tolerated.

SOUTH AFRICA

The census figures for May 1936 put the total number of Indians in South Africa at 2,19,928. Nearly 80 per cent of these live in the province in Natal. The European settlers of Natal are certainly no votaries of the principle of racial harmony. As far back as 1894, they had proposed a law depriving Indians of the parliamentary franchise and, after a minor setback they finally put through the Disfranchisement Act, 1898. In the interval, Mr. Joseph Chamberlain, the then Colonial Secretary, had preached a sermon about "the tradition of the Empire which makes no distinction in favour of or against race or colour." Finally in 1925, Indians were further deprived of their municipal franchise. The stories of other public and social indignities, reserved tram-cars, derogatory epithets and of economic disabilities are only too well known.

The province of Transvaal has a still more revealing history. By the Law of 1885 Indians were debarred from ownership of land in proclaimed areas, which means, in good and fertile areas; the Gold Law of 1908 deprived them of the right of residence in these areas; by the Asiatic Amendment Act of 1919, they could start no new business and, finally, the Transvaal Asiatic Land Renure Act of 1932. the crowning piece of the edifice, has withheld from them both the right of residence and trade except in their own Bazars.

The Union Government is steadily pursuing a civilised labour policy which is also known as the While Labour Policy. Under the operation of this policy, Indians are systematically ousted from employment in the industries of South Africa. The total number of Asiatics employed in industry in the Union was 12,308 in 1917-18; it fell down to 10,215 in 1934-35. This shows that the White Labour Policy of the Government is responsible for driving out of employment nearly 20 per cent of the Asiatics, almost entirely Indians, formerly employed in industry. In the railways of the Union, the twelve years from July 1925 to July 1937 are responsible for the decline of Asiatic employees from 1936 to 506. The 17 years from 1920 to 1937 have brought an alarming decline in the number of Indians employed in the mining industry today,

44,902 Europeans are employees. The staggering decline in the number of Indians employed in the industries of South Africa during the last two decades is still more alaming, when we consider that during the same period the Indian population has increased by about 35 per cent.

The Wage Bill of the South African industry shows the enormous disparity between the earnings of the European as compared to those of the Asiatic and the African. Europeans form 44 per cent of the total number and earn £ 18,800,000, and Africans form 42 per cent and earn £ 4,600,000 and Indians form 4 per cent and earn £ 557,000. The European thus earns three times as much as the Indian or four times as much as the African.

South Africa has a peculiar taste for anti-Indian laws. The South African Parliaments are always discussing one law or the other designed either to inflict further disabilities on Indians or to hurt their national pride. Two such recent projects related to the employment of European women or their marriage with Indians. "Gentlemen, you must realise that you Indians in South Africa will ever be a tragic community because of the tember and temperament of the people of South Africa. They have the tember and that temperament because we are determined to keep this a a White Man's country," is the statement made by a South African Minister for Agriculture.

India had the pleasure to receive a South African Goodwill Delegation in the summer of 1936. Some members of the Delegation showed a fair amount of sympathy with Indian claims and one even went to the extent of associating himself with India's fight for Swaraja. Nevertheless, South Africa is run by such Whites as are incapable of broad visions. South Africa however, has lately shown a nervous anxiety. She is afraid of Italian aggression and German plans. Till three years ago, the South African Defence Minister, who is also an aggressive anti-Indian, did not even listen to projects of joint Imperial defence and is only too eager to have it now. South Africans stand in need of goodwill and they may also be prepared to pay for it heavily.

It is also interesting to observe certain newer trends among the Indian colonists. The Colonial Born and Settlers Association of Transvaal founded in July 1933 appears to be aggressively dissatisfied with the South African Government's schemes of assisted repatriation of Indians back to India or any where else. And

assisted repatriation seems to have been the basic item in the Cape Town Agreement, 1927. In rejecting the Cape Town Agreement, the Association also rejects the specious theory that Indians are foreigners in South Africa. Indians alike as any other race have a right to regard South Africa as their home and contribute to its prosperity. They might continue to retain their cultural bonds with India, but they are essentially. South Africans. The Association's work for inter-racial co-operation and understanding in South Africa appears to be directed tawards near relations between Negroes and Indians.

MALAYA

Indians in Malaya have received the Sastri Report with mixed feelings. They are unable to agree with some recommendations in the Report and feel that a few of their problems have not been touched at all. In regard to wages which were fixed at 45 cents (1 cent=1 pice) for men and 36 cents for women the Report has recommended to the Government of India to press for the introduction of the standard rates of 1928, namely, 50 cents per day for men and 40 cents for women This recommendation falls short of the demand for "adequate wages" made by the Indian Associations of Malaya to the Indian Deputation. Recently the Chinese labourers of the Ulu Langat district plantations has gone on strike and, in March 1937, their demands were partially accepted. The wage rates were decided upon at 75 cents for tappers and 55 cents for male and 50 cents for female unskilled labour. This incident according to our correspondent, shows "what the Chinese Estate Labourers have achieved without any delegation but by direct action." It is thought that, unless the wages of Indian Labour were standardised at a rate similar to the Chinese, they would remain inadequate and the Indian labourer would continue in his present state of poverty and degradation. The Report says that the working day is nominally 9 hours, which in practice is reduced to 8 hours, but it is felt that a straight and clear recommendation of an 8 hours working day was called for.

This takes as to the problem of assisted emigration Even today, Indians form a little over 12 per cent of the entire population of Malaya, over 5 lakhs out of 44 lakhs. During the two years 1931 and 1932, over a lakh of our countrymen immigrated back

into India. Those were years of slump in the rubber industry and the planters were laying back upon the enormous profits they had gorged in the preceding years. Wages were reduced and men were thrown out of employment and they had no facilities for settling down in Malaya. On account of these reasons and the fact that Indians have no political status in Malaya, the Indian Associations of Malaya have ranged themselves against assisted emigration.

There are serious grievances in regard to travel and quarantine. As it is today, the Indian labourer is made to embark at Negapatam, where there the sea is rough and dangerous, while Madras would be much more convenient. All third class passengers are subjected to quarantine in Penang, and some of these are sent back to India on the ground that they suffer or are suspected to suffer from dangerous diseases. It is argued that such a medical examination ought to take place in India and the unfits should not be made to suffer the inconvenience of a trying and futile travel.

The Sastri Report has expressed dissatisfaction at the educational facilities available to Indian labour in Malaya. It is true that the Malayan Labour Code provides for a school in every such place of employment where the childern between the ages of 7 and 14 are ten or more in number. But, the real situation is entirely different. In spite of the fact that there is a very large element of Indian labour, mostly Tamilian, in Government departments and public bodies of Penang, Malaca and Singapore, there is not a single Government Tamil School in these places. If that is the control which the Malayan Labour Department exercises over Government bodies, the extent to which it enforce its regulations upon private employers can well be imagined.

Both in regard to public services and representation on public bodies, the status of Indians is of a decidedly inferior type. The Malayan Civil Service is now limited entirely to persons of British parentage and to Malayans. Till some time back, Indians were allowed to enter the Malayan Civil Service. In this connexion, there is an entertraining statement of the High Commissioner to the effect that he knew of no country in which those who were not "natives of the soil or Englishmen" were appointed to such posts. Likewise, the representation of Indians on the Legislative Council of the Colony and the various State Councils

of the Federated and Unfederated Malaya States is very meagre.

Finally the Indian Associations of Malaya have made a suggestion for the establishment of an Indian Commercial Museum either at Kuala Lumpur or Singapore. Trade between India and Malaya could be made to grow. As it is today, the high freights charged by steamship lines and the absence of any systematic exploration of trade possiblities, the trade between the two countries is very much below what it could be.

The beginning was modest. In 1819, the East India Company established a trading station at Singapur. Today, Britian Malaya comprises a territory of 51,000 sq. miles with a population of 4.4 million. This colony is easily one of the richest in British possession. Of the world's total shipments of rubber nearly half goes out from Malaya so, in 1935, out of a total of 887,000 tons 424,000 tons were exported from Malaya. Of the world's total production of tin ore over 30 per cent is derived from Malaya; so, in 1935, this colony produced 41,000 tons out of a world total of 137,000. But Malaya is a colony and, while labour on the plantations and elsewhere is Malayan, Chinese and Indian, its profiteer is the British imperialist.

President Nehru's fortnight tour in Malaya in May 1937, proved a shake-up to the security of British imperialism as also the torpor of colonial labour as never before. 'The President was called names by the British controlled Malayan press. He become an 'agitator' tactless and ill-mannered' and was sometimes reminded of the wide reach of the law. "*Times of Malaya*" read into the President's exhortation to Indians to gather strength for India's independence an incitement to violence and queried; "strong enough for what, Pandit Nehru ?" Regarding the President's insistence on independence as the goal of India's endeavour, "Singapur Free Press" expressed "doubt as to whether his trip is likely to prove beneficial either to him or to the community in general" and ended up with the rather ominous prophecy "we may shortly be called upon to defend the Indians of Malaya against one who is in some quarters almost worshipped as the supreme leader of the Indian race."

The President had occasion to refer to the charge of misuse of hospitality. What the British imperialist in Malaya perhaps expected of him was "drawing room manners" As to the Malayan himself, the President made the clear statement that

the intersts of the people of Malaya should receive consideration before those of the Indian emigrants. The imperialist however is nowhere an outsider !

When tens of thousands sat listening with eager and expectant faces, what else could the President talk about but of economic liberation and Indian freedom.

A European journalist describes President Nehru's reception by Malaya : "Solegie Road at Singapur was transformed into a river of Indian nationalism. The crowd was intoxicated with excitement, pent up, emotinal nearly to the pitch of hysteria." The Malayan and the Chinese were greatly enthused and they saw in President Nehru the symbol of the unity of anti-imperialist peoples of the world.

Aşide from rubber and tin, Malaya furnishes the British Empire with one of its strongest naval bases, Singapur. The screeching of thr British press is easily understood.

BRITISH GUIANA

Placed on the north-estern top of the South-American subcontinent, Indians in British Guiana are just a little less than half of the entire population of the country. In May 1938, they will celebrate the centrenary of the first advent of Indians into British Guiana. During these last hundred years, some of our country-men have risen into fairly high business and professional positions. Mostly, the are labourers on the British owned sugar estates. Despite an equal franchise and absence of racial discrimination, the voice of Indians in the political management of the country is negligent. Lack of education and of cohesive unity fritters away their numerical strength. Centenary celebrations of the Indian colony in British Guiana have therefore a unique importance. The celebrations will of course be an expression of joy and delight to which our compatriots ten thousand miles away are entitled after a hundred years' labour. But they will also be a call to organisation and determined unity and a desire to share in the political management of the country. As a sign post of the advance they have made in the past and of the growth which will be theirs in the future, Indians of British Guiana have decided to erect a centenary memorial They are already running a paper and have formed an Association and

the centenary building will give them room for further develop ment. To their centenary celebrations. the Indian Association of British Guiana has invited the Indian National Congress to send a delegate.

British Guiana is one of those few Colonies whose statutes are not disfigured by racial discrimination against Indians. The franchise is equal, and if Indians stand at a disadvantage, it is due to their illiteracy. Aside, however, from this drawback of illiteracy for which the Government and our national might be held to be equally responsible, the economic conditions and laws of employment of British Guiana are such that they favour the strong against the weak, the white employer against the Indian labourer. Of the 136,000 Indians, who form over 40 per cent of the entire population of the colony, over 53,000 are employed as labourers on the sugar estates. These are weak and disorganised and live in perpetual fear of unemployment. Ever since the cessation of indenture in 1917, when the Immigration Department also closed down, there is no official agency which may supervise and regulate the relations between the employer and labourer. And the labourers are too backward to form trade unions of their own. In this connexion, the findings of the Labour Disputes Commission released in December 1936, will be found to be of interest. The Report records that "during our investigations, no resident estate, labourers came forward voluntarily to give evidence. We believe the cause of this to be the fear of retaliatory action and possible eviction from house and subsistence plot, with but 3 days' notice, as provided under the Employers' and Servants' Ordinance, and the knowledge that no alternative means of earning a livelihood is readily available." It is astounding how a Statute such as this which enables employers to dismiss labourers and evict them from their houses and plots of land at 3 days' notice is permitted to continue in modern times. The British Guiana East Indian Association has long been demanding the appointment of a Resident Agent General from India to the British Guiana Government. The Agent, they think, would mediate between the plantation-owners and Labour to the advantage of the latter.

IMPERIALIST NEW ECONOMIC POLICY

British imperialism in the colonies is tending towards a new

economic policy. Through the unrest in Uganda and Tanganyika, the strikes of laboures and petty peasants in Mauritius and the refusal of dealers to handle Zanzibar cloves run the threads of the new economic policy.

Pre-war imperialism was content to acquire an increasing volume of profits through extension of its territorial scope. There were large areas, particularly in the East African colonies, which were not yet opened out to imperialist trade. Cotton, for instance, was unknown to Uganda till 1903 when the Government imported a ton and half of cotton seeds. Large parts of the colony were inaccessible. At the close of the world-war, Uganda was already exporting over 47000 bales of cotton of lbs. 400 each. This was possible through the territorial extension of imperialist trade. New commodities of cultivation were introduced; there was an increase in the production of commercial crops at the expense of food crops. African and Arab producers of raw materials in East Africa and Zanzibar and Indian petty peasants in Mauritius now began to produce for the world market. For maintaining and extending this relationship between the producer of raw materials and the world market, mediation of widely distributed traders was as necessary as the development of communications.

India fulfilled the Empire's need in traders and middle-men as much as she satisfied its demand for indentured labour in virgin areas. Indians in large numbers migrated to British colonies in Africa and all over the world When adequate indigenous labour was not forthcoming, they served on the Empire's plantations and in factories. In any case, they were the Empire's middle-men in the colonies. The Indian would put up oil-men's stores in distant villages, where he would, at the same time collect raw materials and sell manufactured articles. One may today see entire British colonies dotted over by thousands of Indian petty traders who carry on a both-ways trade with Africans, Arabs, Guinese, Malayan, Fijian, Ceylonese and other races.

So long, the Empire has stood in need of these traders. They have organised the Empire's network of trade. With their low standard of living and corresponding margin of profits, they alone could have done it.

The Empire can now no longer afford this economic structure which was and adequate enough when there were yet mysteries in the world. Extensive agriculture and middlemen's profits could be

permitted while imperialist capital could yet derive increasing profits out of newer areas What it has lost in its inability to exted its embrace, imperialist capital must make up by further squeezing what it has its grasp. This squeezing takes the initial form of squeezing out the middle-men and thus of appropriation of his profits. It also takes the form of rationalised and more intense exploitation of labour in the factories and plantation and involves the squeezing out of the small peasant.

The small peasant may be squeezed out in either of two ways. He may be dispossessed of his small plot either through sale or for non-payment of taxes and debts. He will then be transformed into a wage-earner and the various small plots of land amalgamated into big plantations as in British Guiana. He may also continue to remain in nominal ownership of the land, but come under the inescapable control of price-regulating and money-lending monopolist concerns. The United Africa company operating in British West Africa is one such concern and has the West African peasant under its clutches.

In Zanzibar, the small trader is being squeezed out and, thus, the livelihood of over, 10,000 Indians is affected. The Zanzibar Clove Monopoly wishes to appropriate their profits and distribute them over imperialist capital in a number of ways. The Monopoly is designed firstly to increase government revenues which are now called upon to contribute towards a new East African naval unit and generally to staff high-paid British Officers. It is secondly so designed as to manipulate prices in favour of distilleries and other imperialist concerns. Finally, the monopoly which is today only a buying and selling concern may easily lead to the concentration of the thousands of African and Arab clove growers into a few big plantations controlled by imperialist capital. Against this monopoly the Indians of Zanzibar are carrying out a peaceful boycott now for over four months. Where Zanzibar Indians have refused to deal as paid-officers of the Monopoly, India refuses to import Zanzibar cloves Bumper crops are standing unharvested. The Zanzibar Government has already lost nearly £ 30,000 in revenues.

In Tanganyika, the Government is proposing a measure similar to the Zanzibar monopoly but more drastic in it scope. Under the Tanganyika Native Produce Bill, state monopoly may be declared in any commodity. The reason is again the desire to

squeeze out the middleman. Unrest if already evident.

A silent fight has waged in Uganda during the last ten years between the small trader in cotton and the big ginning combines A handful of ginners wish to eliminate the small trader and effect concentration through buying combines. High prices for ginning cotton are charged of the small trader and the government is also placing difficulties in the way of the interior trading posts. This assult on the small trader's position is likely to grow and it may easily lead to the intensive exploitation and concentration of Uganda cotton-growing.

Ever since August 1937, there is a serious labour and peasant unrest in the little island of Mauritius. The Mauritian sugar factories have their adequate share of the world trade in sugar and yet they pay only Rs. 20 or sh. 30 a month to their labour. They are also mulcting the small planter both in the way of improper weighments and of low prices. Minor defaults in the payment of rent and debts lead to the auctioning of the estates of the small planters and it is belived that there is a systematic drive to effect concentration of sugarcane growing in a few big plantations. Both as labourers and as small planters, the victims are Indians. It is only to be regretted that there are, alike in Mauritius and Uganda, a few Indian sugar factory-owners and ginners who are assisting in this new imperialist policy of sqeezing the small trader and the small peasant and the labourer.

This new economic policy of imperialism presents both racial and economic problems. Insofar as the attack is at present directed almost entirely against the Indian communities in the British colonies, it is a racial problem. Insofar as the motive of the attack is to rationalise and stabilise a crumbling imperialism, it is an economic problem.

Essentially, the Indian communities in the colonies must grasp the broad features of this world-wide imperialist and racial attack. They have to date known little organisation and their activities have been distinctly individualistic. Barriers of language and social status cause further dispersion. There is also the problem of a few very rich Indians in the colonies who cannot dissociate themselves from imperialist policies. After an examination of all these factors, small peasants, small traders, free professions and labourers should combine and act organisedly in defence of their racial and economic positions. The fight in Zanibar has already started.

Secondly, the Indian communities must realize that the new imperialist policy is essentially an economic policy which involves other colonial peoples like Africans, Arabs, and Creoles. Only on the basis of a strong united front in action of all colonial peoples can imperialism be checkmated in rationalising itself. It appears that in Mauritius such a united front is slowly beginning to take shape and already a joint march of the Mauritian Indians and Creoles on the Island's capital has been carried out. Together with this united front of the colonial peoples, it is to be hoped that the labour movements of the imperialist countries will agitate against colonial oppression and the new imperialist drive.

Thirdly, India can effectively support this struggle of her overseas communities and other colonial peoples. Without her boycott of Zanzibar cloves, the Zanzibar strike would have been of little avail. She has to exercise similar vigilance in regard to unrest in other British colonies.

UNITED STATES CITIZENSHIP

There has been considerable agitation both in this country a and in the United States with regard to the eligibility of Indians for naturalisation as United States citizens. The Indian National Congress has often shown anxious concern over this problem. In the United States, Senator Copeland introduced in 1926, a bill to grant citizenship rights to Indians and considerable agitation, though unsuccessful, followed.

Under the provisions of the Naturalisation Act "aliens being free white persons" and "aliens of African nativity and persons of African descent" are admitted to citizenship. Through correspondence exchanged between the United States Department of Labour Immigration and Naturalisation Service and the Foreign Department of the Indian National Congress on complaints that arise from time to time, a variety of interesting facts is disclosed.

Indians could only be admitted under the provision of "aliens being free white persons." In the course of a judgment the Supreme Court of the United States concluded that an Indian is not a "free white person." Its argument are fourfold. Firstly the framers of the original law did not have in mind the brown or yellow races of Asia. Secondly, the racial category of "free white persons" should be applied to a group of living persons "now

possessing in common the requisite characteristics" and not to such as may be "descended from some remote common ancestor." Thirdly, the Indian type, even if originally Aryan, has been "so changed by intermixture of blood as to justify an intermediate classification." Fourthly, the children of Indian parentage do not merge into the merge into the mass of American population and lose their distructive hallmarks as those of English, French and other parentage do. The Supreme Court has added that it does not intend to suggest the slightest question of racial superiority or inferiority.

It is obvious that there are two strands of reasoning in this judgment : One is based on popular prejudices of colour and features. The other rests on the supposed necessity of the State of a uniform population. On the basis of these two prejudice, one popular and another scientific, ever 15,000 Indians in the United States are relegated to a secondary status.

In the interests of closer co-operation among the different peoples of the world for peace and progress, it is necessary that such laws are either revoked or their application modified. The Supreme Court was of the opinion that all Asiatics are generally excluded from citizenship but has prudently added that the final determination could only come upon the consideration of particular cases as they arise from time to time. In this consideration of particular cases, two thing are deciding importance. Indian opinion must be so vigilant as to react unfavourably upon any attempt to reduce Indians to a secondary status in foreign countries. American opinion must be sufficiently progressive so as to appreciate the need for closer collaboration of the human races.

INDIAN CREW IN CHINA AND JAPAN

Indian crew of ships going to China and Japan are poorly and shabbily attired. Some shipping companies, it is reported, provide uniforms and clothings to poorly paid crew, but no Indian crew is supplied with such tning. If the respective companies employing Indian crew are asked by the Government to see to it that they are properly dressed when the ships are in foreign parts and that they are supplied with a couple of suits at the expense of the companies, the present state of affairs would end.

INDIAN POLITICAL CONFERENCE IN LONDON

An Indian Political Conference was held in London in the month of July, 1936. Representatives of Indian and British organisations and individual delegates discussed the situation in Indian and the ways and means of furthering the campaign for India's independence in Britain.

The Conference adopted in all eight resolutions of which the "Political Resolution" is concerned directly with our movement for complete national independence. This resolution which is again split up into several parts lays down that the agrarian problem is the fundamental problem of India today, that, as a result of merciless exploitation for 175 years under British rule, the poverty of the Indian peasant has reached lowest level, his average income being 2d. per day head, and that the kisan has only to meet the extortionate demands of the British Raj but also the exorbitant rents and interests of the landlords and the money-lenders. A solution of this problem by reform or parliamentary legislation is impossible; it can be achieved only by the initiative of the oppressed and exploited masses themselves. The Conference, therefore, rejected the New Constitution which it styled an ingenious fraud designed to continue the reign of terror. To achieve success against this offensive of Imperialism, the Indian National Congress must mobilise the widest strata of the population into a decisive struggle against Imperialism and, accordingly, grant affiliation to Workers' and Peasants' Organisations. Such a Propular Front should have for its minimum the demands : (1) Release of all political prisoners, (2) Repeal of all repressive laws and restoration of civil liberties, (3) Freedom of speech, press, association, (4) Substantial reduction of land revenue, moratorium on peasants' debts and security of land tenure, and (5) Fixed minimum wage, 8-hours day social insurance. The Conference re-affirmed the demand for complete independence of India outside the British Commonwealth of Nations and the immediate withdrawal of all armed forces from India. It called for a complementing of the slogan of rejection of the New Constitution by the positive slogan of the Constituent Assembly.

In another part of the resolution, namely, India and the Fight against War and Fascism, the Conference urged all workers and peace-lovers of Britain to realise that their struggle is identical

with the liberation movement of the peoples of India and other colonies.

The Conference demanded removal of disabilities on Indian seamen in Britain who since the Shipping Subsidy Act, of 1935 are refused employment in British ships as also effective measure against the present state of humiliation and distress of Indians abroad. The Conference demand the abolition of the Education Department of the High Commissioner and the dismissal of advisers to Indian students at British Universites, as they were engaged in anti-Indian activities and espionage on students. Conference protested against suppression of civil liberties in India. It condemned the Fascist conquest Abyssinia and Japanese aggression in China and wished the dastardly and infamous betrayal of Abyssinia by the League Powers to be known to the world. The Conference, in welcoming the Foreign Department of the Indian National Congress, stated that the real scope of work lay in the ranks of the discontented elements of the labour and socialist movement in foreign countries.

7

THE DOCTRINAL FOUNDATION OF SOCIALISM*

RAMMANOHAR LOHIA

Socialism, the only hopeful doctrine of the age, is in a bad way. All Asia except Burma, all Europe without Scandinavia. Yugoslavia, and a fitful England or Austria, and three whole continents have not yet felt the power of socialism or drawn its benefits. This lack of power moves alongside of lack of mind. Torn between the world of capitalism and communism and socialism is unable to evolve into a doctrine which world reconile the claims of stability and of change, which would serve the needs of stability without strenthening the *status quo* as well as the needs of change without fomenting chaos. This lack of a Socialist mind is revealed in sundry ways. In India it leads to hesitancy in action, to frequent lagging behind the cohorst of capitalism or of communism. In Britain, it leads to an unresolvable tension between the need of austerity and the aim of increasing prosperity. In the US, it makes earnest Socialists wait revengefully for misery during which they can carry their gospel to a depressed and responsive people. Internationally, it causes the going of separate ways by Socialists of different lands. as, for instance, the opposition between French and German Socialists on issues of coal and steel and the European army.

Socialism is a newer doctrine than capitalism or communism.

*Speech; Pachmarhi, May 1952,

That will explain some of its failings and also give hope. Faulty applications and organization are another cause. But the career of socialism is impeded most by its inability hitherto to secure a doctrinal foundation. No living doctrine is ever fully founded or closed. That day will be dismal when Socialists cease to complain of their confusions. But there must be adequate doctrinal foundation of consistent logic that gives socialism an autonomous direction in thought and action and saves it from confusions that disperse and scatter. Socialism must ever be a doctrine that grows, but it must also ever seek the principle that hold its various limbs together. Socialism should cease to live on borrowed breath. Too long has it borrowed from communism its economic aims and from capitalism or the liberal age its non-economic and general aim. An acute disharmony has resulted. To explore once again the economic and the general aims of society and to integrate them into a harmony should be a high endeavour of Socialist doctrine.

The establishment of social ownership over existing means of production, their further development and mass production, and some kind of a planned economy are acknowledged in varying degrees as the economic aims of socialism. The preservation of national freedom, democracy, and human rights, and the securing of peace and of what are variously termed as the values of culture of the spiritual equalities of life are believed to be the general aims of socialism. This grafting of one on the other is full of peril to the future of socialism, for it encourages the disastrous belief that economic democracy prevails under communism and political democracy under capitalism, and all that needs to be done is to join them. Even the otherwise felicitous concept of democratic socialism sometimes inclines men to seek one of its profiles in capitalist democracy and the other in Communist dictatorship, and a general weariness of thought and action follows. Both capitalism and communism have their own integrations, and whatever disasters they might yet heap on mankind, they are at least logical monsters. Unless socialism is able to disintegrate the premises on which capitalism and communism are founded and arrange instead its own harmony of economic and general aims, it will continue to be an illogical doctrine that refuses to come of age.

Capitalism is a doctrine of the individual and of free enterpries that leads to ever-changing application of science to industry and

agriculture. In its economic aims, it seeks mass production and low costs and profit to owners. In its general aims it seeks democracy and morality through adjustment of diverse interests and peace through balance of power. This capitalist integration held good for one-third of mankind, to whom the benefits of its revolutionary technology have strictly been confined, although it has led even among them to periodic crises and wars. It has engendered the clash between owners of concentrated capital and their proletarian gravediggers, the clash between forces of production and relations of production, but it has also produced the grave contradiction between massive means of production over one-third of the earth and the decaying apparatus of production over the rest. This contradicition has like a knife cut the world into two; peoples living upwards of 40 degrees north of the equator have at least acquired bodily comfort while the much vaster numbers of others are submerged in misery, but the whole world bleeds. Capitalism imposed the peace of death on Asia and elsewhere, caused their population to grow and their economic apparatus to decay. While growth in population and in mean of production proceeded alongside among the white or pink peoples, the more coloured peoples suffered a loss in arts and crafts together with an increase in population.

To this day, pinks of Russia and America live under 50 to the square mile, and although some parts of Europe have reached high densities, they have their vast production apparatus and still have the vast colonial hinterland of Africa to fall back upon. The coloured peoples have already attained unbearable densities, for instance, 300 to the square mile in India and 600 in Java, and their productive apparatus is so woefully meagres as to compare, Rs. 150 worth of tools per person with Rs. 5.000 to Rs. 8,000 of tools per person among the white peoples. To provide to such enormous populations the tools of agriculture and industry which would bring them on a level with Europe and the US is an impossible task for capitalism and its private property or mass production. Capitalism has ravaged the coloured peoples so much that they cannot now respond to its embrace, however affectionate. The task of capital formation over two-thirds of the world if far too colossal for private capital to accomplish Capitalism cannot even fulfil its primary function of providing capital to mankind. The effort to spread the capitalist integration, which has hitherto

been of local application among the white peoples, to all mankind and make it universal is foredoomed to failure. Poverty and war have been the monstrous progenies of capitalism, poverty for two-thirds of mankind and war for the 'rest, and it is powerless to destroy its own children. In the midst of such appalling poverty of the coloured peoples, morality through free interprise and democracy through adjustment of interests are impossible to achieve, and national freedom is a precarious treasure however had won. War continues to be the great temptress for the whites.

Communism is a doctrine of social ownership and of release of means of production from their relations of private property. It foresees as high a general aim of culture as any other doctrine, when men will no longer need government and things will be administered, but in the process it brings into being a centralized party earlier and a centralized state later in order to release the forces of production and to develop them. To it, the morality of a stateless society is in no contradiction with the immorality of a dictatorial party and state, for it has achieved such a complete integration of economic and general aims that the latter inevitably flow from the earlier. It argues this immorality away with the plea that the fulfilment of economic aims will inevitably lead to the securing of general aims, and as the dictatorial made of the party and the states are a condition for victory, the immorality of the process is actually a high servant of the morality in the ultimate. The whole Communist doctrine and its general theory on human civilization is proving faulty, for capitalist relations of production are snapping where the forces of production are least clamorous. This defeat of Communist theory may be left aside, but the parctical disasters of Communist victories in areas of high density and low technology must be keenly appreaciated.

Communism inherits from capitalism its technique of production; it only seeks to smash the capitalist relations of production. Communism claims to be the continuator and developer of capitalist technology, when capitalism is no longer able to do so. What capitalist technology has meant to two-thirds of the world has not been digested in Communist theory. There are paltry forces of production and huge populations. Communist rationalization of these economies or a hot-house nurturing of productive forces are impossible except through mass murder unknown to history, and then too, almost impossible.

To turn a peasant of India, Java, or China into a worker, a cultivator into a tractor driver, or to provide a factory worker of these areas with the concentrated capital of modern technology may or may not be a high endeavour, but its achievement is impossible and it shall stay a barren and cruel effort. Lands averaged around 15 acres for every agricultural worker in Russia before collectivization and the tractor brought them on somewhat at a level with American agriculture. Where lands average between one acre and one and a half as in India and China, the Communist modernization of agriculture would throw tens of crores of people out of work. They could not be absorbed in modern industry, for that too would require an unachievable capital. That the process could be spread over a century or a half would not be possible in view of the tensions between the rationalized and unrationalized sectors of economy, between those privileged to receive the comforts and amenities of Communist rationalization and the vast unrationlized mass of people, and the growth in population.

By any standards of employment commonly called rational in Europe or the US, over half of the population living in two-thirds of the world is unemployed. This unemployment is indeed concealed, for almost everybody appears employed although they are all chronically underemployed. To secure employment to such great numbers, even according to lower European standards and not those of the US, a capital investment running into more than Rs. 50,000 crores for India and five times that amount for all the underdeveloped areas would be necessary. A mere statement of the requirements reveals its fathomless absurdity. On the basis of India's current Five-Year Plan and taking the multiplier factor into account, around 15 such plans, or a period of 75 years, would be needed. A bigger capital investment under communism, made possible through ruthless suppressions, may at best reduce the period to 50 years. During this period famine and others tensions would cause untimely death by tens of millions, unheard-of brutality and certain collapse.

Baring textiles and railways and such like industries, which too would need large capital renovations if they are to be brought up to European standards, every sphere of economy will have to be rationalized almost from scratch. Assuming that an annual capital investment of Rs. 500 crores for a First Five Year plan were somehow available to Communist India, it could at best provide

rational employement to one million persons on the basis of Rs. 5,000 worth of tools per worker Very limited regions and small sectors of economy could benefit. Communism would indeed know how to abolish unemployment by concealing it under the guise of under-employment, a practice which it has followed in Europe and which is all too familiar in the underdeveloped two-thirds of the world. But it wohld not be able to conceal that the few more Calcuttas and Kanpurs it might build would rest on the dry bones of tens of millions dying in the numerous hamlets and towns of the country. Is there then no way out ? There is none, if the accepted modes of rationalization, common to capitalism and communism, are pursued and the mind refuses to display its intelligence and ingenuity.

A new mode of rationalization and a corresponding mode of ownership will have to be devised. The small-unit machine run by electricity or oil is the answer. Only a few such machines exist : many more will have to be invented. Technology, which the modern age has kept ever changing, will have to make a revolutionary break with the present. The problem will not be solved by going back to earlier machines discarded by modern civilization, but by investing new ones with a definite principle and aim. This machine shall be available to hamlet and town as much as to city; it may be a mind-of-all-work or as many kinds as possible; it shall be build on the principle of immediacy in operation and output; it shall not require a large capital investment. Such a machine is not the product of decentralization in space, which modern civilization in Europe and the US has started talking about and which keeps the existing principle of technology intact, but it is the embodiment of the whole principle of decentralization, in space and in time so as to avoid complexity and achieve immediacy. This machine will not only solve the economic problem of the underdeveloped world; it will also enable a new exploration and achievment of the general aims of society. This is not to deny altogether the heavier machine in steel works or in river-training projects, but emphasis must heavily rest on the small-unit machine. On the basis of investment assumptions made earlier with regard to Five-Year Plans, rationalization carried out through such machines may well provide employment to ten, instead of one, million persons annually.

This immediacy in science and planning must be matched with

immediacy in ownership and political control. Private property must of course go, except such as does not occasion employment of one person by another Ownership of property by the state exclusively at the centre goes with mass production and is disastrous both for bread and freedom; property of appropriate types must be owned by the village and the province as much as by the centre and by co-operative. Socialism must irrevocably reject all doctrines of restricted capitalism and mixed economy. In this connection, the debate between redistributors of land and efficiency-mongers who fear a decline in production consequent upon increase in uneconomic holdings is interesting. The efficiency-mongers do not understand that there is no way to evoke volunteer zeal and labour for minor irrigation projects, and so to achieve great capital formations without cost, except through providing land in however small quantities to all tillers.

Even apart from the fact that general aims of society do not so inevitably flow out of economic aims as is proposed by Communist theory, the pursuit of economic aims of communism in conditions of high population and low technology is a delusion and a disaster. By Communist reasoning itself, fullness of freedom shall come after the achievement of fullness of bread but, as communism shows no way to rationalize underdeveloped economies, what tend to become permanent are the general aims it adopts in the process and not those it preaches as an ideal. The centralized party and state and all that they give birth to seem to be the only achievable general aims of communism. Communism can provide neither bread nor freedom to two-thirds of the world.

A widespread notion ascribes the cultural deficiencies of communism to certain elements and traits of the Russian people. It is argued that the older cultures of India and China or the democratic conscience of the British people would soften communism. The reverse may well be true The Gita and similar philosophies which India has sung will perish at the first touch when communism starts rationalizing Indian agriculture, which does not possess the wide scope that its Russian counterpart did. Already China's terror has surpassed in some ways that of Russia and should the average of one or one and a half acre per agricultural worker be pressed into the moulds of Communist rationalization, there is no knowing to what lengths the spirit of man may have to be suppressed. Soviet Russia would then appears to have been

civilized in its processes. This is not to deny the imperishable glory of the Gita or the old cultures, but to recognize their importence when countrary economic aims sway the government of the day. They are effective only so far as they make difficult the victory of a creed of cruelty or assist in the encouragement of later disobedience to it. These general aims and motivations of man have a fragile quality, and yield noble fruit when handled with devotion. They cannot amend conditions of economic contrariety, and then can only exist hypocritically without effect or provoke disobedience.

Capitalism and communism share a certain community of economic aims insofar as the latter inherits the former's processes and forces of production and alters only its relations. Mr. Ford and Mr. Stalin share each other's attitudes on mass production and efficiency and high wages, and although Americans may point out the significant difference of democracy and Russians the equally significant difference of social ownership, this community of outlook between them is of the most decisive import. The new world must go beyond them both, beyond capitalism and beyond communism, if for no other reason than that the techniques of mass production are inapplicable to two-thirds of the world. Communism alters only the capitalist relations of production and seeks to reproduce its forces; socialism must alter them both. This is no rejection of the machine, but it is a rejection of the situation in which the heavy machine and its counterpart, of the Leviathan State, predominate. Nothing but failure lies at the end of a long trail of savagery, should ever the underdeveloped world decide to form itself in the image of the developed an ambition common to capitalism and communism. Some persons reconcile themselves to the savagery in the hope of succcess at the end of it; they will ultimately be rewarded by the bitterness of defeat and the remorse of cruelty. Communism wants to move history backwards and to repair the ravage of capitalism by imitating its ways of mass production. That cannot be done. Socialism must know how to move history forward.

About the need of early destruction of capitalism and feudalism in two-thirds of the world, there should be no doubt or hesitation. Capitalism must increasingly mean poverty of body and soul to this part of the world. It cannot even feed these populations; it must perpetually undernourish them and occasionally

starve them to death. It can only produce for profit, and there is not scope for profit in these undeveloped economies, not certainly in food and houses and tools that may make the small man produce wealth, but perhaps in margarine, medicines, cinemas, and, above all, in speculation. It is increasingly reducing man to the status and work of half-man, half-horse, for, in India and elsewhere horse-carriages are dying out for want of returns and being replaced by men who pull men. Retail traders multiply and factories decay. The trust symbol of Asia today is the rickshaw and the man-horse; for capitalism cannot provide many other openings for a living. Imitative of the ways of its rich white cousins, capitalism in the underdeveloped areas carves out little islands of security and luxury in an ocean of black misery. To do that, it excels in buying and selling and specializes in hoarding and speculation It even speculates in people's food and health and children's textbooks, for textbooks are altered almost every year to yield profit to their privileged publishers and writers. In the developed areas, honesty may be a good policy; India and similar areas prove the impossibility of making an honest living. Over everything settles the smell of decay and death; decay of body and economic aims and death of soul and general aims. Such a capitalism can no longer be pruned or amended; it must be uprooted and here is not much time to lose

No greater disaster could befall socialism than if the historical peculiarities of its career in Europe were sought to be universalized and reproduced in the other two-thirds of the world Socialism in Europe has been gradual constitutional, and distributive. Socialism henceforth, and in the rest of the world, must be drastic, unconstitutional when necessary, and lay the accent on production. The great deeds or, European socialism in the sphere of the welfare state must remain an inspiration and a model, but Europe's socialism had a reservoir of massed forces of production, which Europe's capitalism had built and from where it could distribute. Socialism in the rest of the world must build the reservoir as much as it has to distribute its contents justly. It has to set up the investing and capital-forming community before it can achieve the welfare state. Where such a productive apparatus has yet to be created, socialism must needs be drastic, and in order to be that, it cannot always adhere to the slow processes of constitutionalism While European Socialists have earned lasting credit for their

refusal to misuse power of government in order illegally to defeat then opponents and for their faith that to lose democratically is better than to win dictatorially, and thus set up a model of constitutional action when socialism is in office, socialism in opposition must often about the ways of struggle. The processes of persuation and law-making are not always available or timely; to them must be added the methods of class struggle, particularly in the undeveloped areas. Class struggle hastens and matters the destruction of capitalism, without which two-thirds of the world cannot even make the first move.

The class struggle against capitalism is expressed through two major types, that which destroys capitalism in one of its aspects and reinforces it in another, and the other that achieves socialism. Depending on what one thinks should be the outcome of the struggle against capitalism, one chooses between the two types. Those who believe that capitalism should be destroyed in its aspect of private property but should be strengthened in the aspects of its own peculiar technology and forces of production are naturally fond of large concentrations centralized control, and apparatus in which everything gets done to the detail according to a master-plan. Such an approach inevital, strive for power to the exclusion of all else. All such struggles and forms of party organization are encouraged in which, no matter how much the general aims of society are sacrificed, power appears to ensue. Hatred becomes the chief motor of such struggles and organization. As this power will be unable to achieve its economic aim of the big machine in industry and the combine in agriculture in two-thirds of the world, it will be marked after victory by barren cruelty, as it is based on barren hate in the period of struggle. Such a class struggle. however fiercely waged, is reactionary, for it can at best destroy capitalism in its aspect of private property but must restore it in its aspect of technology, and to two-thirds of the world this technological restoration of capitalism will spell economic barrenness and general inhumanity.

Socialism must devise forms of struggle and organisation which destoy capitalism in both its aspects. Its struggle and organization must correspond with its economic aims It aims economically at a technology that rationalizes economy not sector by sector nor region by region, but, as far as possible, in all sectors and regions at the same time. This immediacy must also

characterize its struggle and organization. Not remote, but immediate, tests should be applied to the expressions of class struggle. Immediate tests would ever keep in the fore ground issues of democracy and culture. Remote tests often sacrifice these for the achievement of power. The aim of immediacy in science and planning should be matched with the aim of immediacy in democracy and power. Such forms of struggle and organization must be encouraged which diffuse democracy and power to the smallest unit, which assist every being to travel on the road of initiative and responsibility. Remote tests have led to a situation in which no act of struggle contains its own justification, each act is sought to be justified by the outcome of the next, the chain of justifying acts lengthens, and the outcome of it all is horror and the death of general aims of society Each act of struggle should contain its own justification Its immediate quality must be such as makes it pass the tests of general aims of society. It must not justify a present lie by future, truth, an immediate bureaucratization by remote democracy, a present sacrifice of national freedom by a remote one world an immediate murder by a future health. Man is today become victim to ideologies of remote success, so that the chain of acts of horror lengthens and the last link of the good act is never forged The immediate test of the good act should characterize the class struggles of socialism. Only then will socialism amass power enough to destroy capitalism in both its aspects and to achieve the economic as well as the general aims of society.

Communist modes of action and class struggle completely fail the test of immediacy. High priests of communism have rejected all notions of absolute morality and have raised evil behaviour into a noble virtue as long as it serves the cause of revolution Socialists of India are becoming familar with the communist empire of lies Although the Socialist Party in India took no money from the US or any other foreign source for its election campaign, the party of communism, ably supported by conservatives, carried the lie into the remotest village. Those who believed the lie should have known that the doctrine of socialism admits of no shot cuts to success and relies exclusively on internal resources for its political action, while the doctrine of communism obligates the receiving of foreign aid and the telling of lies for the revolution. Communism also jumps from one lie to another, so that trying to catch upon it and deny it is a waste of effort.

In similar wise, sacrifice of national freedom and treason becomes a commendable virtue if practised for the international solidarity of the working class as expressed through Russia or China. Democracy or parliament is utilized alone for its destruction, and, what is perhaps worse, the hierarchical spirit and cult of complete obedience to the party leads to the abandonment of all responsibility and democratic conscience except such as is expressed through the highest committee. Mass violence and purges are necessary instruments. Above all communism denies reason and has no faith in the capacity of the people to reach a decisively clear judgement except through civil war or improbable conditions of democratic maturity as in England. It holds capitalist control over information, education, and the army strong enough to prevent the people from giving a decisive verdict in its favour. A doctrine such as this, which does not trust the people fully, is never reciprocated with adequate confidence of the people. A Communist government through the vote for a whole people is therefore a contradiction in terms. Until communism achieves its problematic victory through an insurrection, its chief role is to split the Socialist vote, thus to assit in the continuance of a conservative government.

Conservatism and communism have a strange identity of interests against socialism. Conservatism holds socialism as its democratic rival and does not fear communism except as a threat of successful insurrection. Communism prefers the continuance of a conservative government and is mortally afraid of a Socialist Party coming to office, for its chances of an insurrection are then dimmed. Until communism revolts successfully, it is a doctrine of succour and support to the bourgeoise. Even after a successful revolt, it does not cease to be a doctrine of evil behaviour, for its economic aim of mass production and abundant living is unachievable in two-thirds of the world, and consequently its general aim of a remote culture is an ideal that ever recedes. The class struggle of communism is a doctrine of deceit, lies, treason, tyranny, decay of culture, and also, of assistance to capitalism until a successful revolt takes place.

The like debacle of capitalism and communism is easily understood when they are viewed as parts of a single civilization that appears to have neared the end of its voyage. All civilizations have aimed at comfort, culture, peace, and the ideal kingdom,

and what distinguishes one civilization from another are the processes to attain them and their precise content Every civilization is moved by certain purposes of life and certain specific drives. To seek to understand these human purposes through categories such as religious or secular, authoritarian or liberatarian, rational or emotive, feudal or capitalist, spiritual or materialist is not an adequate venture. Modern civilization can not be understood in terms of democracy or totalitarianism, private or state property alone. The distinguishing drives of modern civilization are continuous application of science to economy, rising standard of living, and increasing social equality. What moves a modern society is the impulse for an increasing output, and a modern man, the desire for rising standards and an improving home. No previous civilization entertained such impulses, for it did not possess a revolutionary technology. Nor was any previous civilization so powerfully influenced by the passionate urge for social equality, also now possible through this changing technology. The modern man, whether in the US or Soviet Russia, is moved by identical aims of increasing output through mass production and a beautiful home, and wants these purposes to be placed within the reach of all, primarily within his own nation. At the end of the realization of these aims lies heaven on earth and the ideal kingdom, equality, peace, and the full life. But roadblocks are multiplying.

The three qualities of modern civilization, revolutionary technology, rising standards, and social equality have run into trouble. Revolutionary technology is face to face with the demon of its own creation that it cannot slay, the terrifying poverty of two thirds of the world. No matter what amazing heights it is reaching in the US, of the USSR, it is unable to expand in West Europe, the first seat of its glory, where it has stayed constant in the past three decades. Those who hunger for rising standards are breaking their teeth on the stone of a constant or decreasing output. The anxieties, tensions, and general emptiness arising out of the unstillable hunger for increasing output and living standards are becoming unbearable. The relationship between man and things is reversed so that things use him rather than he them. West Europe, the prince of modern civilization, is showing the same irritation towards the US which India has been feeling against West Europe, the irritation of a poor relation or, perhaps, the wisdom that comes after having been outraced by a

newcomer, that the race is anyway not worth running at all. The tensions and emptiness of modern life seem difficult to overcome, whether under capitalism or communism, as the hunger for rising standards is their mother and is common to both. Capitalists expected their ideal kingdom to arise out of each man's self-interest operating under a perfect competition; Communists still expect their ideal kingdom to arise out of social ownership over means of production. Their common fallacy has now shown up, that the general aims of society do not inevitably flow out of certain economic aims. An integrated relationship between the two sets of aims has to be set up by the intelligence of man Likewise, social, political, and economic equality, which has reached heights unscaled by any previous civilization and which has made the duchess and the laundress look almost alike, is cracking up because it did not at the same time explore spiritual equality. If previous civilizations broke down under the weight of a spiritual equality coupled to a social inequality, modern civilization appears to be cracking under the weight of a social equality coupled to a spiritual inequality. Collective life has become so callous, and man is but the object of an experiment

The mind of modern civilization came to the end of its voyage some decades ago. The present century has known only one originator, Mahatma Gandhi, and only one discovery the atomic bomb; the discovery is the culmination of modern civilization, same as the orginator came out of a womb not yet identifiable or strong. Modern civilization has placed idea entirely in the service of force, and it cannot be otherwise as long as its three drives are not subjected to a relentless examination. The accusations against each other of capitalism and communism, of the US and the USSR, mount, but they are unable to slay the twin demons of poverty and war, and what they say or do only serves to heighten their demonic quality. They have enveloped the world with fear and hate. Man is no longer at peace with himself. He must move away from existing civilization in both its aspects of capitalism and communism. Their kindred qualities and drives have made them both equally irrelevant to the venture into a new civilization. This theory of equal irrelevance must not be confused with the doctrine or equal evil or the contemptuous wishing of a plague on both houses. This theory does not set itself upon a high moral pedestal from where to judge and denounce; it is perfectly

aware of the imperishable glory of the existing civilization and its achievement of social equality which was never before reached by any earlier civilization. There is much to learn from the thought and practices of the existing civilization, and many of its features will inevitably go with due integrations into the new human effort. The theory of equal irrelevance is the decision of the traveller on a new road who refuses to be tempted by the two other roads that go round and lead nowhere. Nothing is more fatal for such a traveller than to waste his time in comparisons between the two other roads; they are equally irrelevant to him, and, if a language of overtones must be used, they are equally good or equally evil.

Adherents of the Atlantic as well as the Soviet Camp are deeply hurt by the theory of equal irrelevance. They are correct in diagnosing the virus of the opponent but are singularly blind to their own. Concealment of such viruses denotes grave peril to mankind. There is no need to keep quiet over the suppressions and tyrannies of communism, the disaster of its economic aims when applied to the underdeveloped areas, and the barren cruelty that it represents. There is equally no need to keep quiet over the Atlantic effort to act as world's policemen and instructors on behalf of decay, the girdle of firm dealing and reform they are trying to throw round all the world, and their mad culmination of modern civilization. Nevertheless, it is said that possibilities of change in a democracy make it preferable in any event to a dictatorship. These possibilities are theoretical Even property relations are exceedingly difficult to change, but a civilization has never yet been known to fly out of its skin to change is specific drives and purposes. A living civilization prospers or is relegated; it does not change. Should this rare display of human intelligence even occur, those who achieve it will recognize that the theory of equal irrelevance was correct until then. It is true that possibilities of free conversation and devate enable contacts among likeminded people in all lands, which gives joy. Meanwhile, what an armed guared accomplishes under communism is generally obtained by the pressure of events and conventions, which outflank a heretic, in a democracy. Possibilities of chang within the framework of the existing civilzation are not altoghter absent in communism. They come unheralded and without debate. A Yugoslavia may be a rare event, but it has happened once. Some Socialists who detest communism find greater kinship with the Yugoslav

Communist Party than with Socialist parties of many a land. After their break with international communism, Yugoslav Communists are facing toward socialism, with their gallant instinct for national freedom and for a force away from the two camps, and their taste for decentralization.

The peoples of all hands have endearing qualities and they all equally relevant to the new civilization. The two forms of the existing civilization, capitalist and communist, are equally irrelevant to a new creation, but not so the peoples living under them. Who will not be fascinated by the young vitality of the Americans and their direct virtues, the method and thoroughness of the Germans, and mellow manners of the British ? Such Slavs and Chinese as one meets whet the appetite, and the Slavs awaken nostalgic memories of the common ancestor of some centuries ago and cause regret that one cannot oftener make contacts with the great peoples of Russia and China. Communist governments have erected three barriers between their peoples and the outside world. None but Communists live in these lands so that a meeting of like minds, unless one is a Communist, is not possible. It is only natural that a Socialist of India should feel a kinship with the Socialists of Burma or Yugoslavia, France or Africa, Germany or America, which he cannot with the Communists of Russia or China. The people-to-people relationships are further soured, because only under communism do a whole people and its government form exclusive friendships with Communist parties of all lands, to the natural irrigation of their non-Communists. Lastly calumny replaces argument, and, although the Socialist Party of India is just as much pro-American as pro-Soviet, international communism has heaped lie upon lie in order to malign it as an agent and spy of America. The builders of a new civilization will not lose their self-assurance. They will criticize where criticism is due. They will not counterbalance every criticism of America with a simultaneous criticism of Russia or *vice versa*. An argument must take its course, and lack of self-confidence must nor mar its logic. Organised non-violence must be able to look both communism and capitalism in the face, without flinching but with pity, and without hate but with anger. Enmity may fade away

There is now a remote possibility that the grim combatants of existing civilization may somewhat relax their tensions and cold war. They may be willing to listen to proposals for an

international pool of resources and for international brigades of reconstruction. The poll will help underdeveloped areas create faster what they cannot do by themselves. If the developed areas help the underdeveloped world create what it needs, it will in its turn help them to conserve what they have already created. Creation and conservation will be joined together. The brigades will throw together men and women of all nationalities into a common effort of reconstruction and peace National qualities may melt into one another, and excess may be cured. From the white world's activity may be shed its strife; from the dark world's poise its sloth. Activity may wed poise. A physical and cultural approximation of humanity may for the first time take place by design. The youth from Africa, American China, Europe, India, Russia, and other lands and continents working together on projects of well-being may create a temper for peace such as the tortured world of today cannot imagine. Some government should gather enough courage to keep on presenting proposals for World Brigades of Reconstruction and a World Development Authority through the UN and similar bodies. In any event, people's organizations must move as many young men and women as possible away from their habitual surroundings and make them labour and build in strange lands, not only to give what they know but also to take what they do not possess. The dark world may learn to be less slothful, and the white world may give up some of its strife, and this cultural approximation of various races may well prove to be one sure way to pluk the prize of peace. The cult of co-existence of hostile systems is fuzzy, but the doctrine of co-existence with approximation enforced by a higher world conscience may enable them to to co-exist cure their excesses, and approximate.

Capitalism and communism are but two parts of the single complex of existing civilization. Often before, a civilization has split up into two warring prongs in a valiant effort to renew itself and their shots are heard throughout the world so as to deafen men against the still small voice of the new civilization. The Communist theory on humun civilization is all upside down. If an earlier idealism seized upon the peak point of history attained in Russia as man's fulfilment, the Communist theory has similarly wanted to freeze the peak points attained in West Europe into eternal splendour. History does not move entirely within a civilization. If it did, no civilization would ever decay or be relegated, and

there would be no shifes of power from one region of the world to another. When a civilization flickers, the torch generally passes into the hands of its out castes. The out castes of the present civilization are the underdeveloped two-thirds of the world. But they are worthy of the torch only if they make a break with the old and devise their own forms of thinking and living. What may happen, for the first time on earth, is a joint endeavour of the human race to devise these new forms. That will be the rarest intelligence and a consummation devoutly to be hoped. Who likes these continual shifts ? At least not the Asians, who remember the ashen taste of having in the past sat on the peak points of history.

Socialist parties in European lands and of the US will do well to link their thinking and action with this great drama of a change-over in human civilization. They have hitherto brought their peoples up on the desire for an ever-increasing standard of living, and their action in that direction has been limited to their national frontiers. They should now venturesomely ask their peoples to help achieve a decent standard of living for everyone in the world. even at the cost of some sacrifice in their own standards. Their peoples will understand. They pay regularly the cruel price ot war for national progress in their material standards. The reward for some sharing of what they posses in order to secure international progress in living standards may well be peace. Indoctrination into the demand for ever-rising standards of living within national frontiers is patently wrong. It leads to frustration when not realized, as in England. Its thunder is stolen by the capitalist, as in the US, and it does not answer the American's need for peace of mind Socialism should be a doctrine that thrives not alone in misery but also in conditions of comfort and comparative luxury. While decentralization of technology and political power may be exceedingly difficult to practise in West Europe and the US, their socialism should somehow inscribe on its banner the demand for a life of poise and slower tempo. It must indeed campaign for such programmes as a national health service, civil disobedience against injustice, and nationalization as in England or the guaranteed annual wage as in the US. While the twin demands for a decent standard of living to all mankind and for a life of poise and peace without hunger for ever-rising material standards for peoples of Europe and the US may give world socialism its new drives, a

World Parliament and a World Law should also be sought to secure the freedom of the smallest nations and to abolish war. Further more, European socialism has had to become a part of the Atlantic Camp. Instead of trying to shape world socialism in its own image or persuade Asia's Socialists to adopt its foreign policies. European Socialists should with for added strength to Asia's socialism in its striving to chisel the distinct features of socialism as the creator of a new civilization. While Asia's Socialists should never tire of keeping away from both forms and camps of the existing civilization and of providing socialism with its own distinct face, they might treat Europe's Socialist with consideration, whom the accumulation of past deeds and history seldom lets act except as a corrective.

An event of great significance is the projected full conference of Asian Socialists. It is only proper that gallant little Burma, whose leadership rests in the wise hands, of U Nu, U Ba Swe, and U Kyew Nyein, and which enjoys the benevolent presence of that rare treasure of Asia, Mrs. Aung San, should be the venue of this conference. While Asia's Socialists will fulfil their pledge only to the extent that they become aware of the great problems of human civilization and therefore do not imitate Europe's Socialists, they must ever prize the world unity of socialism as a high aim of their endeavour. No one is a Socialist unless he is equally free and friendly with Socialists of all lands and skins.

The foregoing examination of economic and general aims reveals that they have both their autonomous existence, but that a doctrine of their integration is possible. This integration also provides the doctrinal foundation of socialism. The contemptuous theory, shared alike by capitalism and communism, that general aims are automatically secured after the fulfilment of certain economic aims must be rejected, if for no other reason than that the economic aims of both doctrines are impossible to fulfil. Another theory that any set of general aims can be superimposed by man's effort on any set of economic aims is somewhat more insidious. This theory grants an independence to both types of aims which they do not posses. Their autonomy is valid only to the extent that they are integrated into a harmony; otherwise one must give the right of way to the other. Without integrated harmony, it is generally the economic aims which command the right of way, no matter what calamity they might threeby bring.

The democratic and liberal faith, the great religions and the creed of organized non-violence must all give the right of way to whatever economic aims a society sets for itself, unless these aims are shaped in the image of such faiths. They may be remembered at prayer-time and on ceremonial occasions or when a person gives himseif the luxury of contemplation. They may at best somewhat colour the personality and cleanse the main stream of life just a little, but they are powerless to alter the flow.

International socialism operates on the hypothesis that on the economic life of planning and mass production and rising standards can be grafted the general aims of society through an effort of all the will. All that needs to be done is sanction to the charter of human rights, to democratic representation, and workers' control and, generally, to the worth of human personality, The absurdity of such an imposition has been indicated. Some variants of the hypothesis of international socialism have shown up in Asia. The Socialists of Burma, for instance, believe that Maxism and Buddhism are symmetrical doctrines, that Marxism satisfies the material needs of man while Buddhism answers the spiritual needs, and that the two can and must go together. Such a belief is patently illogical and untenable. But this belief can under certain conditions produce beneficial results, which will in turn lead to the correct doctrine. Burma Socialists will soon enough he faced with awkward situations in which they will be called upon to surrender either Marxism or Buddhism, but, if they fortunately prove true to both, they will be compelled to achieve they theory of integration of economic and general aims of society.

While it is necessary to give a firm foundation of the theory of socialism, it is equally necessary to discover the appropriate forms of action through which the doctrine may be realized. An unfortunute emphasis his hitherto been placed on two modes of action, electioneering activity and insurrectionary activity, and opposition has been allowed to develop between the two. Socialists are often wont to resort the democratic process of the least when unsuccessful and to resort to insurrectionary action, at least in speech. To the extent that the Party's Policy Statement encourages, even though without meaning it, this polarity between the ballot and the bullet, it needs to be supplemented with a clarification.

All actions should be aimed at the expession and organization

of the people's will and at reconstructing the national life in whatever measure possible. While doing good in the immediate, they should amass power enough for socialism in order that it may defeat capitalism. The organization of the people's will is of primary importance, and its expression through the vote or revolt or other appropriate forms is a secondary question of passing value. The party of socialism must have power and organization enough so that it can use them in the service of whatever action may be deemed appropriate at the time. In order that such power and organization may be built up, the party of socialism should coutinually strive to become a spokesman of the people, organizer of its will, resister against injustice, and accomplisher of reconstruction. It must be ready ever to take part in constructive action, to enlighten the popular verdict and be enlightened by it in turn, and to resist injustice : three modes of action already symbolised by the spade, the vote, and the prison.

Parties in office or such as depend on the maintenance of the *status quo*, and those which use hate and their fear for growth have always found constructive action a dull and tardy affair, but the doctrine of socialism cannot thrive except through constructive action. It must indicate to the people, even while in opposition and in however small and ineffective samples, what it wishes to accomplish when in government. It must do good even while in opposition so that it live not alone on promises about the future, but also on accomplishment in the present. The Socialist Party has in the recent past attempted to unfold a whole range of constructive activities around agricultural reconstruction. It has attempted to move the people to dig for minor canals, wells, tanks, roads, and other protects. These and other types of constructive action must become the primary and acknowledged modes of Socialist action. A central reason why organization of the peasantry and factory workers, such as the Hind Kisan Panchayat or the Hind Mazdoor Sabha, have not grown as fact as they should is their neglect of constructive action. The Kisan Panchayat must be built to resist injustice, and equally so, to change people's habits with regard to food and the way to eat, raising of crops and making of manure, and to assist them in storing and marketing of produce and in finding good tools.

Such constructive action is also a chief instrument for organizing and educating the people. The Socialist Party must learn

from its experience that mere enrolment of members does not lead to an organization, nor do its persistent efforts for a volunteer corps or a youth movement bear fruit. Other parties that live on hate or fear may find it possible to train a volunteer corps through simple drilling or parading or through acts of fitful violence. The Socialist Party must learn that organization will come to it and its affiliates as a by-product of action and not as someting which is aimed at directly. Only to the extent that its members and units are put to tangible work does organization result. As long as Socialists aim at organization directly, they will be frustrated, but when they aim at some concrete reconstruction organization will automatically come out of it. The problem of political education can be solved in a similar way. Propaganda meetings and the circle are the two chief vehicles for political education. The Socialist Party has lacked in the study centre. Apart from the fact that efforts were not so persistent, a main reason why the programme of study centres has failed is the absence of concreteness and its lack of anchor. A network of study centres must be woven around a network of constructive centres.

The village or the unit that builds up a constructive and a study centre achieves two parts of a single activity, and will prosper in both. Political workers as a rule lack in regional knowledge, no matter to what party they belong, or however much they may be able to mouth stale theory. That is way they are unable to withstand the encroachment of bureaucracy upon democracy. In order that democracy may achieve the greatest diffusion of power and active participation of the people, the politician down to the smallest unit must be equipped with regional knowledge as much with theory. Unfortunately, however, a great deal or regionalism in spirit obtains, while there is little or none at all in knowledge. Politicians of the village, as much as of the nation, are naturally prone to guard their preserve against outsiders, not through better knowledge but through disastrous sentiments of exclusivenes. A study centre hinging on a constructive centre will equip such politicians as much with regional knowledge as with theory. Socialists must overcome their corrupting aversion to reading.

It may also not be forgotten that the Indian people are perhaps the saddest on earth and the element of delight is lacking in them and their politicians. Short temper, working at cross purposes, and intrigue mark politics in India more than elsewhere.

Politicians in other countries do not take opposition and defeat quite so much to heart, and engage in other pursuits of delight and joy. The puritanism of the politician in India usually turns into sour intrigue, all in the service of the high ideal he imagines to profess. Whatever, therefore, scatters this grey sadness and expresses the natural instinct of delight and joy must be acknowledged as a genuine type of constructive action.

Constructive action must be supplemented by resistance to injustice. Throughout the world, and more so in the under-developed teritorries, a doctrine and a party is judged not alone by what it professes but also by the extent to which it can struggle and suffer. The people are drawn to a faith that brings out the capacity to bear witness and to suffer. Apart from the political advantages of a struggle, it is difficult to believe that a genuine doctrine can stay unmoved in face of an injustice and, whenever a doctrine does so, there is something lacking in it. A propagandist agitation against injustice, if it is not fake, must necessary lead to resistance.

The Socialist Party has in the recent past suffered generally from a miscalculation. Eager to organize the popular verdict in favour of socialism, it thought that a diffusion of activity into struggles would reduce its capacity to win votes. Such a mechanical conception of organization is wrong and socialism should never again repeat the error. It has now been established that areas where Socialists undertook resistance to injustice have generally returned them to the legislatures, no matter how long they stayed in prison or how much their organization was apparently broken up. The spade, the vote and the prison are all inter-related activities and whatever mode of action powerfully influencss the people's will, its effect is undoubtedly felt in the other spheres.

Another error obstructs the free expression of *satyagraha*. It is commonly supposed that a call for resistance to injustice must go out from a higher committee before it can be undertaken by primary units and members Undoubtedly, situations arise in which a whole nation or a whole state is called upon to bear witness to its faith and to struggle against injustice. But there are other situations in which no such call can go out and where primary units and even the individual must shoulder the responsibility for an act of resistance. Whoever refuses to resist injustice

when other forms of agitation are not available or exhausted, becomes a party to it. To the extent that such potential *satyagrahis increase* in a nation, to that extent is the nation free. The best defence of freedom is the readiness of individuals and of primary units of organization to resist injustice. Of the two types of civil disobedience, that undertaken on the call of a high committee and the other carried out by a primary unit or individual, the later requires a greater democratic awareness.

No society is completely free from injustice, but India and the other underdeveloped territories abound in misery and repression. Various issues of chronic undernourishment, starvation, and famine, land ownership, high prices, dismissal and unemployment, expensive medicine and education, high rents and no houses, and on top of them, police repression are daily acquiring such proportions that the whole of India may well become a vast stage for intermittent practices in *Satyagraha.* A day may come later when the whole nation is summond to organize resitance against injustice and for the achievement of a new order.

A fancy opposition has been allowed to grow between *satyagraha* and class struggle. There is in fact on such opposition, and a genuine class struggle is civil disobedience. It is commonly believed that the driving motive of *satyagraha* is to change the heart of the opponent, while the theory of class struggle admits of no such change of a whole class and therefore requires the overthrow of the existing order. While civil disobedience is indeed a mode to change the heart of the opponent, it is even more an effort to reduce his power and to increase the power of the good doctrine. *Satyagraha* and class struggle are but two names for a single exercise in power, reduction of the power of evil and increase in the power of the good. That a change of heart does take place is evident, more so in the ranks of the good doctrine, in so far as they acquire greater determination and organization and capacity for action, but also in the ranks of the opponents, some of whom being to be declassed. It must be repeated again that an act of *satyagraha* or class struggle must pass the test of immediacy and it must not make use of lies or deceit or violence Crude practices should be eliminated.

The issue of force plays a large part in any Socialist debate, and some Socialists believe that ultimate overthrow of the existing order cannot be carried out except by force. This debate has

proved harmful to the progress of the Socialist doctrine and movement. Whether force is ultimately used or not is a secondary question, and the primary issue is whether to organize the people's will on the basis of peaceful struggles or otherwise. The distinguishing feature of a movement should be whether it advocates and organizes violence, and not whether it ultimately uses force, A brief instant may be reached in the life of the people when the existing order rests alone on bayonets, and these bayonets are shaky, and the vast mass is determinedly striving for the new order. In this brief moment, the people may well choose to exercise their majesty of power so as to end the agony of the old and give birth to the new. This will be spontaneous violence of the people displayed only for a brief moment. One may hope that even this may not be necessary. In any event, such a momentary display cannot become the enduring basis of a theory of organization.

A mark of degradation of man is the extent to which he makes and listens to demagogue appeals of force. Such appeals to voilence are a denial of reason and of the basis which may one day enable man to rear a decent life. Doctrines which ennoble voilence are incapable of achieving a classless and casteless society. Socialism must learn to distinguish itself rigorously from such doctrines. Socialism must ever denounce the advocacy and organization of violence, and it must strive to achieve such a basis of peaceful struggles as will lead to increased individual initiative and responsibility and not to concentration of power. Organization of violence inevitably leads to concentration of power. The use of violence is a major issue in the world of today, and large numbers are beginning to realise that the advocacy and organization of violence is bad even when used for good purposes.

A tremendous difficulty has indeed shown itself. Violence is of two types, that which expresses itself in the relationship of two or more states and in wars, and the other which expresses itself in the internal politics of a people through murder and insurrection. Against the violence of wars; no method of peaceful struggle has yet been evolved, although some feeble and praiseworthy attempts are being made. But the internal politics of a nation need not now pollute itself with recourse to organised violence. Modes of peaceful struggle are available. All the good world must make a mightly effort to dramatize this issue of organization for nonviolence versus organized violence in such

a fashion that doctrines which glorify violence are stripped of their glamour.

The great continent of Africa is eminently suited for this drama in human affairs. Issues of national freedom and of discrimination between man and man on the basis of colour and creed have come to the fore. Shall these issues be decided by the organization of nonviolence or by use of organized violence ? A great event of our times is the decision of the people of South Africa to practise civil disobedience. The rest of Africa is also striving for national freedom. There have been international brigades in the past to take part in wars. The time has now come for an international brigade recruited from all over the world to take part in this African endeavour for the organization of nonviolence. If the Socialist parties of West Europe may find it embarrassing to raise such international bridgades, the Socialist youth may well do so. There are many number of other liberal-minded people, pacifists, religious men, and democrats throughout the world, who could assist in such an effort. Inside the great Republic of the United States, their is ample scope for the exercise of civil disobedience on the issue of discrimination between Whites and Negroes and on problems of citizenship. That is not to deny that similar scope is available on the issue of caste system and citizenship in India. The day may come when the exercise of civil disobedience in numerous countries of the world produces its effect on peoples living under communism. The whole world must be jostled out of a smug belief in the advocay and organization of violence. Callousness and brutality, whether on the part of the government or the people, must go. Instead must awake a world mind which holds violence in contempt and revulsion but which also knows how to resist injustice nonviolently.

When socialism is able to unfold continuous programmes of construction and struggle, the winning of votes will naturally follow. No one should minimize the importance of the vote, for it is the grandest expression of the people's will. This expression may sometimes go counter to the doctrine and programmes of socialism, but it will not do then for the Party to blame the people or deride the vote. Both the people and the Party are at fault in such an event, for if the peoole are not sufficiently enlightened the Party too is not sufficiently mature. A main defect of Socialist agitators is to look upon themselves as teachers of the people,

and they must realize that they are students as well. A two-way relationship of student and teacher should be established between the people and the Party. Whoever is aware of such a relatioship will look upon an electoral reverse as a spur to further efforts for improving the Party and enlightening the people. The majesty of the vote should never be derided, for there is no alternative to it. In another sphere the alternatives are between peaceful struggle against injustic and organization of violence, between peaceful revolution and armed insurrection. "Ballot or Bullet" is a wicked presentation made by capitalism and communism; the choice is "*Satyagraha* or Bullet."

The party of socialism must indeed learn to approach the people with a richer variety of programmes than hitherto. The accent on peasants' and workers' movements must continue, but a more deversified approach should be made to other sectors of the population, including the middle and professional classes. The Party must also become sensitive to general problems of the day and be able to sweep the whole people into movements that lift them up. While food and corruption are obvious issue on which to move the people and where the government may be forced to appoint high policy committees consisting of representatives of all major parties in the country and to take action, the great value of general and cultural movements should not be lost sight of. Such are, for instance, the great movements for world parliament and world peace and for the consolidation of Socialists in Asia and throughout the world, and for international brigades, whether of reconstruction or peaceful struggles The Party should also be able to play its part in the cultural, literary, and artistic life of the people without wanting to establish a political dictatorship over it

Socialism should act more powerfully with regard to issues of caste and in relation to women. The party of socialism in India and some other underdeveloped territories has indeed resolved to destroy the system of caste and subjection of women, but it generally inert on these issues. Some Socialists have been slow on these issues for fear of the hostility that they might arouse or in the belief that after establishment of a Socialist government, these issues would get resolved automatically. Some have also thought that there was no point in making a special appeal to women as they would go alongside with their men. Such notions

are mischievous. Not only do they lose many valueable votes that would otherwise have come to socialism; they do greater harm by obstructing the party in the fulfilment of its essential functions. The party of socialism must be brave enough to open a full-scale attack on social evils prevailing among the people. Should it appear for a brief moment to lose popular approval, it should be sustained by the hope and the knowledge that the people will come to it in increased numbers after obscuring clouds have been cleared away. No party wins if it is unwilling to risk temporary disapproval for right causes. The Socialist legislators must seek out occasions in their various parliaments to remove social evils, to destroy the systems of caste and wedding expenditure, and to control growth in population. Socialists must be willing to state outright that the decay attendant upon systems of caste and marriage settlments destroys for more than transitional excesses that may arise out of free social relationships. A Socialist movement without the active participation of women is like a wedding without the bride. Not only are women ultimately responsible for the health of the race and the growth of the new generation; they are also the chief support of a movement for peaceful resistance. Every six out of ten men, but every eight out of ten women are today undernourished. The Socialist Party and the women of India may both ponder the need of coming together.

Every Socialist organizer must strive to become the campanion in life and in death of his locality. He must have fun and friendliness enough so that no festival or feast is complete without him; he must be ever ready and resourceful in having petty complaints removed; he must combet injustice; he must be comprehensively aware of all the constructive possibilities in the area and take part in their realization. There has been a lamentable tendency to self-pity and to bemoan the lack of zeal and discipline among Socialists. A Socialist does not and should not possess the fanatical hate of the communal or Communist reactionary, and we should be happy at this But the Socialist has at times shown the deep springs of loyalty and devotion that lie within him; he has risen to heights of sacrifice and works himself to the bone when the spirit moves him. He is also somewhat lethargic and lacks concentration, and is sometimes quarrelsome; in fact, the fine youth that forms the core of the Socialist Party is sound; what is needed is to free this gold of its dross, and the time for it

has come.

There is nothing more important than educational and training programmes, an arm of the Party which has been so sadly neglected hitherto. In the absence of training into the doctrinal foundation of socialism and its combination of sympathy and anger, he imbibes the hate around him and feels frustrated when the Party's programmes do not enable him to express it. The Socialist must learn to integrate the economic and the general aims of society. He must spurn the spurious doctrine of water-tight division between private and public life. While cruel and ignorant puritanism must be rejected, there is no need to countenance deceit and selfish intrigues and undemocratic behaviour. While each one must draw his own line on how far he can go without transgressing into vulgarity, this line must be drawn, and a Socialist code for conduct should voluntarily grow. There is also need for Socialist ashrams, at least one in each state, to which members of the Party could repair in times of spiritual need and which would radiate an atmosphere of creative work and creative rest. These ashrams should be largely self-sufficient out of such crops and crafts as they can produce. It is in the Indian tradition to build ashrams for the training of the spirit and the spread of a doctrine, and every movement in the world has built its own centres in the name of the commune or some other. A sound doctrine and training into it will probably give the Socialist movement an uplifting quality of the spirit, so that its acts of sympathy and its acts of anger are all passionate. Whosoever touches it will then be suffused with the joy of oneness.

Certain principles of organization must in addition receive the Party's assent. The inglorious centralization of intiative and decentralization of discipline must be rapidly reversed into the decentralization of initiative and the centralization of discipline. While discipline is largely internal to a man and the outcome of a doctrine held with conviction and of training, it must also be externally enforced. Disciplinary action may be rare, but it must be quickly enforced and without fear and partisanship Various limbs of the Party must be taught to help one another, and their centres and the Party must grow a nervous system. Decentralized initiative will probaly be the weightiest factor towards the growth of a disciplined party. Co-ordination in activities and choice of priorities must also be attempted. Much has been made of the difference in speech of those who are commonly called leaders of

the Party. This difference in speech would have resulted in an orchestra had there been a co-ordinated offensive on selected targets. Because of the country's vastness and other reasons, such a co-ordination has been lacking. It must be attempted anyhow. The leaders, needless to say, are tied with inescapable bonds that will not let them seek, another companionship.

New persons will come into the Party. The people of India, in particular its intellectuals are showing greater interest in the Party, probably because of a heightened sense of responsibility in view of the threat of stagnation and chaos. These newcomers should be welcomed with warmth. They must indeed not aspire for office straightaway, for that makes them suspect in the eyes of others and does not provide them a period to qualify and make friends. The Party must learn adjustment. Not everyone should be expected to do every job. The Party must also learn to dismiss with contempt the maligning done by its opponents of newcomers old comrades, with a view either to stem the expansion of the Party or drive a wedge into its leadership. A dirty political trick of opponents is to pick out persons from the Party, some for praise and others for denunciation.

Socialists must also learn to appreciate the principle of withdrawal. Withdrawal is not necessarily permanent; it may be temporary or from certain spheres. Either because a person has not been too successful or feels inconvenient in certain spheres, or has just been there too long, or for clarity in policies, he may retire from relevant offices and executives, and such temporary withdrawals should occasion no comment nor sorrow. His activity will not diminish, whether as crew or as captain. In this land of non-attachment, politicians retire only when they die, for they are either indispensable or greedy, and the line between the two is not always easy to draw. The principle of temporary withdrawals will add freshness and zest to political life. New men will get trained; they will express their zest and also become responsible. This will minimize the chances of organizational disputes over personnel of executive turning into ideological disputes. People will cease to fight an unreal and disastrous battle of ideas, when they are actually fighting a battle of organization. The leadership of the Party, whatever it may be at any moment and from village right up to nation, must concern itself with policies and programmes and their execution and the display of manifold initiative at all levels,

and let the organization run its own course democratically within the limits of discipline, even if that course may appear to be somewhat unpleasant.

Awkward situations arise when judgement have to be made and opinions differ. Democracy knows no way other than that of debate and majority decision Such judgments are not necessarily correct. But that is no reason why those who differ should go behind these judgments, seek out imaginary motives for the error, and translate every difference of opinion into a crisis of principles. No party can live in a state of permanent crisis. At the same time, judgments should be made in the light of considered principles and after weighty consideration and not on grounds of expediency or under pressures. There should be no display of autocracy or compulsion. Decisions are being made every day, officially and unofficially, which appear eminently correct to some and equally incorrect to others. Such are, for instance, the unofficial decision for the red cap and official decisions on the presidential election. prohibition, united front, and on issues which cut into agriculture and industry at the same time. The red cap is in India's tradition of sectarianism and devalution of deepest philosophies into outward symbols. While return to the white cap as a headgear of national unity may be somewhate difficult, the Socialist Party must cure itself of externalism and exercise itself on the evolution of a dress which will not reveal the wearer's politics or religion. Even after the Congress Party had badly mismanaged the presidential nomination and in view of no Socialist or superior candidate being in the field, the outstanding merit of President Rajendra Prasad as a freedom fighter and of having later borne himself with dignity and fairness should have met with recognition at the hands of the Socialist Party. On all such issues, there are bounds to be debate and differences of opinion. One may hope for an earnest debate, but it should not degenerate into a crisis.

An incipient polarization between the Congress Party and the Communist Party seems to have emerged as a result of the general elections. This poisonous seed must be scotched before it bears foul fruit and paralyzes the nation's mind and activity. There are reasons to hope that the polarization is temporary and a timely warning to India's Socialists to act. It would be a mistake to ascribe the gains of the Communist Party to its programmes or energy and to the illiterate belief that misery breeds communism.

Misery may breed good and evil; there is no reason why, with faith and work, it should not lead to the belief into socialism. Two main reasons have resulted in Communist gains. The Communist Party has been willing to act, however mischievously. Its belt of electoral victory is strictly co-terminous with the areas where it burnt and killed. Without going into the comparatively irrelevant question of whether Communist terrorism was a provocation for or a retaliation against governmental repression it must be noted that the Communist Party was thoroughly trounced where it did not burn and kill, in the big northern and central belt. The lesson of this remarkable happening must be drawn. Poverty and misery have so harassed the people that they are willing to lend their ear to whoever apparently suffers for them. They will be drawn to the Communists when the government chases them and inflicts unmerited suffering on many innocent people in the process. The people have, however, shown their conclusive perference for peaceful struggle wherever they were provided with the opportunity to judge and choose.

The fact of Communist gains in areas of their violent activity also opens out a dangerous prospect. Having tasted victory, they are likely to repeat the adventure which gave it, in other areas. Whenever the Communist effort at constitutionalism exhausts itself, they adventure will start. This will naturally never give them the majority, but it may well establish them in the estimate of around one quarter of the people, a vantage point from where they will expand their own army of liberation and hope for a turning of the regular army. The Socialist Party needs to devote its attention to the soldier whose loyalty and refusal to take part in shooting politics is a mainstay of India's democracy. The solider must on the one hand be made aware of the forces now at large in the world, and on the other his problems, such as the monthly pension of Rs. 15/- to Rs. 30/- after he is crippled and disabled in a battle, must be brought into the open. Much more than this, the Socialist Party must forestall adventure into violence by its own constructive action and peaceful struggles throughout the land. Communist gains must also be traced to the two temples of international worship which they have erected, Russia and China. Once a worship starts, all questions of right and wrong dissolve, as all wrongs are done for the greater glory of the temple. It is useless to expose Communist tactics, their twists and

turns and their acknowledgment after every four years that they were wrong in the earlier period, without exposion the true nature of their worship. Once the mind is seized with the idea that the Soviet temples are saviours of mankind and that they will inevitably grow, it does not batter whether a Communist party allies itself with capitalism and the government of the day, whether is preaches democracy or dictatorship, for all that is a problem of tactics. India's intellectuals and government have in the recent paste encouraged worship in one such Communist temple, but these are reasons to hope that they will not long continue to force silence on the telling of truth about such centres of worship.

Socialists of India must know that tbe reasons for their reverses are removable Socialist candidates were the youngest in the country; Socialist doctrine has not yet been firmly grounded; the Party has now and then adopted a facing-both-ways policy; its record of constructive work and struggles in the recent past has not been too impressive; it spent four *annas* to the vote while Congress and Communist expenditure averaged between Rs 1/- to Rs. 1/8/- to the vote. Barring the lack of abundant money, all other reasons are removable. The Party shall never be able to command big money, whether from loot, foreign sources, or the native rich. This lack of big money will eventually work to the Party's advantage, for the people of India will one day realize that some of its good work is not being done for lack of money. While there should be no attempt to conceal that the Party was unable to scale the heights it contended for in the general elections and somewhat mauled in the process, no Socialist should ever insult the nearly 12 million people who reposed their confidence in socialism by pooh-poohing the Party's vote. That is a good enough springboard for future action. The twelve Socialists in Parliament have each a million persons behind them. Even if the Communist Party had somehow been able to set up the same number of candidates as the Socialist Party, it could not have got that large vote, as is evident by its complete trouncing in UP and Bihar, where none, of its candidates won, and it secured only one-tenth per cent and one per cent of the total votes cast.

The Socialist Party must definitely abandon its facing-both-ways policy in doctrine as well as in programmes. It should never be an auxiliary team of the Congress Party nor schould its members only fair to note that much of the criticism on this score inte is rested

propaganda by opponents. The battle between capitalism and communism is so grim that, both nationally and internationally, socialism is regarded by both combatants as a kink to be ironed out. These two holders of power possess enough resources in propaganda to ridicule successfully the Socialist Party from their different angles. Communist wrath is old and too wellknown, but a recent example of suppression practised by the international capitalist press in the killing of a decisive and news-making statement in favour of the third camp by U Kvaw Nyein, that alert mind of Burma who was once her Foreign Minister and has now chosen to be the secretary-general of the party which rules the land. Such suppressions are common nationally. Both the Congress and the Communist Party would very much like to rub the Socialist Party out of existence, for it is their essential foe. Nevertheless, there is some truth in the accusation that the Socialist Party does alternate service to the Congress and the Communist parties.

As long as the doctrinal foundation of socialism is not secured, the Socialist Party will continue to be torn between the Congress Party, which will often appear as the instrument of democracy and national stability, and the Communist Party, which will as often appear to be a party of change. The frequency with which labels like rightist and leftist are used adds to confusion. The Socialist Party must be willing to take risks, to see in itself the expression both of national unity and of change, and to act irrespective of immediate and apparent consequences. It would do the right act, even if that should appear for the time being to enhance the mischief of the Congress and the Communist Party and be willing to run the risk of temporary extinction.

The two elements of democracy and national freedom which go into the making of the Congress Pary give it an advantage over the Communist Party. In the long run, the Congress Party is, without a doubt, superior to the Communist Party, for one may reasonably expect it to act democratically and nationally within certain limits. In the short run, however, the Congress Party is the party of famine and corruption and disguised capitalism. Socialist support extended to such a party would defeat the very purpose for which it was intended. Such a policy of support would disable the Party from organizing the people's will and combating injustices, and a section of the people would turn to the Communist Party in a state of mad frustration. The Congress

Party is indeed to some extent a coalition of conservatives and radicals. Contrary to popular estimate, such a coalition does more harm than good and confuses the public mind with regard to radical views and forces. The radicals in the Congress Party to more harm than its conservatives. There can be no question of the Socialist Party treating them with consideration or wooing them. If a split occurs in this coalition within the Congress Party it would be due to the pressure of events in the country. The Socialist Party can increase this pressure by intensifying its own constructive action and peaceful struggles and initiating political moves in a big way. Socialists must overcome the temptation to liken the Congress Party to the Kuomintang and to forecast a bloody revolution and a Communist victory in the event of the Congress Government refusing to change its policies and programmes. This tends to awaken to mistaken belief that a Communist government would act better than the Congress Government and, what is more disatrous, it makes the people look upon the Socialist Party as a helpless spectator and adviser. Between the stagnation of the Congress Party and the chaos of the Communist Party, the Socialist Party must ever appear to intervene like an enveloping power.

Socialist speech-making and action often furthers the interests of the Communist Party, for it is sometimes difficult to distinguish between a Socialist a Communist speech. The mistaken notion of a community in economic programmes of the two parties must be removed before the Socialist Party is able to generate a people's force that would shun the Communist Party. Otherwise, the Socialist Party will suffer the continual ill-luck of the rewards of its labour going to the Communist Party. When Socialists generate hate and immorality through their speeches and are unable to express it in their action, an addition to the strength of the Communist Party naturally results.

Certain unities of national life are above party. There must be full respect shown to the national flag and song Unities of dress, food, habits, calendar, and the like must grow. There must be a universal readiness to defend the nation in the event of outside attack. The element of violence should be eliminated altogether from the internal politics of the country. The Socialist Party must do all it can to further these national unities. When a climate of disgust against the use of violence grows of India as it has in the

West European countries, even Communists may find it profitable to act within the pale of democracy although under compulsion. The Socialist Party must awaken this repulsion against violence, not by moral exhortion but by the most mainfold organization of nonviolent resistance against injustice.

The general elections have for the time being resulted in the fragmentation of the nation's political life. Besides these three parties, a large number of other parties and groups have appeared on the scene. The electoral inability of the Socialist Party to challenge the Congress Party as the only alternative agency of stability and change is doing some tricks to the minds both of the people and Socialists In a situation such as this, it is only natural to look for scapegoates and to refuse to look for the real sources of failures, but Socialists must resolutely overcome either temptation. There must be of course no short temper not mutual recrimination and accusation, for every one of us has been guilty. The temptation to go back to a restricted membership must also be resisted and the healthier attitude necessary to expand the organization and to remove its defects must grow. Another easy way is to look for coalitions and united fronts. Let there be no escape from duty and no fear of isolation. Much of this yearning for coalition or united fronts is the refusal to face reality and to struggle the hard way for removal of defects. The Socialist Party will be eternally cursed if it is seeks easy solutions and escapes from the duty to reinvigorate itself, or fear isolation.

There is no need to emphasize that a policy of coalition with the Congress or United Front with the Communists paralyzes, for it leads to dishonesty in publie conduct and to further fragmentation of political life. A main argument of upholders of United Front is that they could thereby expose the true character of their temporary allies. Such an attitude of exposure of one's own allies is basically dishonest. Communists are at the moment playing two separate tricks of United Fronts of Leftists and of National Democratic Fronts, and they can afford to do so in view of the great temples of worship that they have built in Russia and China. Parties which do not command such temple of worship nor wish to do so should ever avoid trickery. Nevertheless, the Socialist Party must face the fact of fragmentation of political life and outline an honest political policy, which would serve to consolidate the nation. Its essential task is to rejuvenate

itself and develop its own constructive action and struggle, but it must not refuse to shoulder responsibility for an honest political line of consolidation.

Three broad types of political groups other than Socialists, Congress, and Communists have appeared on the Indian scene. One type is represented by political groups like the Forward Bloc RSP, the Peasants and Workers Party, and the RCP which have, in varying measures the twin impulses to be better communists than the Communist Party itself and also to be loyal to democracy and national integrity. It must be noted that every such political party has split up into two hostile and independent groups, one predominating in its sentiment for communism and the other unable completely to overcome its loyalty to freedom and democracy. These parties must soon enough realize that the absence of a considered doctrine and of a massive party embodying it will pulverize them further. The second type of political gorups is represented by parties like the KMPP, Jharkhand, and Scheduled Castes Federation, and the third type by parties like the Ganatantra, Mahasabha, and Ram Rajya Parishad; and the Jan Sangh seems to share the characteristics of both these types. While the second type has blurred the line between radicalism and conservatism, it may under favourable circumstances add its weight to the growth of a massive redical party, and the third type may under similar pressures join the Congress Party. The youth of the Jan Sangh may travel either to socialism or communism, and its leadership to the Congress. There is need now to work out a political line which would in time break up the coalition of the Congress Party and send to groups represented by the third type and some elements of the second type. The Congress Party will then become in outward form what it is already in actual reality, a clean and outspoken party of Indian conservatism. This political line must also consolidate groups represented by the second type and elements of the first with the Socialist Party, so that this party becomes in time a clean instrument of Indian socialism and radicalism and is able to absorb all other radical elements when they split away from their various organizations. The Communist Party will, in such an event, lead, as it should, an isolated existence of extraterritorial loyalty, of doctrinaire hair-splitting and of unfructifying calls to general strike and insurrection. The Socialist Party must be able to unfold a political movement which with its

wide sweep achieves such a consolidation.

A recent movement of significance is Sarvodaya. Although the Sarvodaya movement is no political party, nor does it aspire ever of become one, it has been able to release a massive upsurge of national energy round a programme of land redistribution. The Socialist Party may recall that the first act of voluntary land-redistribution in recent years was carried out under its auspices by Socialist Mohammad Zuhair in the district of Lucknow. The Sarvodaya movement has given to the programme of voluntary landredistribution continuity and passion. Large numbers of poor farmers are offering to share their lands with still poorer and landless farmers. This arousing of a feeling to share and of good neighbourliness is of inestimable advantage both to the people of India and to the doctrine of socialism. While the limits of such a movement must never be lost sight of, Socialists must continue to participate in it Change of heart and change through laws or peaceful struggle are two sides of the same coin, both equally important. There is a point at which both types of change must coalesce if barrenness is not to result. Many revolutions of hate have occurred before but they have replaced one tyranny by another. The world has also awaited many a revolution of love, but they never materialized. While communism is a doctrine of date, Sarvodaya has hitherto been an indequate doctrine of love. Only when love and anger, love for all and anger against injustice, find a combined expression through a revolution, will humanity be able to make the next onward move. There seems to be a spark in Acharya Vinoba Bhave which has already led to this massive expression of love in collective life and which may one day lead to an equally massive expression of anger. While the Socialist Party should continue to support the Sarvodaya movement in its programme of voluntary land redistribution, it may be noted that every party and movement expects Socialist support without extending a like support in return. One may legitimately expect the Sarvodaya to extend its support to the Socialist Party in all its movemsnts which express anger against injustice and sympathy for all.

The Socialist Party has suffered a temporary reverse. If it frets and fumes and tries artificially to capture attention, it will be but one of many other parties, without rudder or compass. The great test for a party comes when it suffers adversity. Can the

Socialist Party take it ? To take it would mean to bide one's time and to prepare, to strengthen one's base and doctrine and further train the spirit. India is on the threshould be famine, and is being continually stunted, and deaths by the million may suddenly overwhelm it. Another test might come to the Socialist Party much before the next five years have passed and in quite a different way. Meanwhile, it must construct whatever it can and struggle wherever it must. Possibilities of some big movement of ideas and national emotions may also come its way. Man's current civilization is cracking, and nothing but socialism can lead him into the new age. Victory belongs either to barbarism or to socialism, and there is no middle way. There may be many defeats yet for socialism. Those who set out to build a new civilization must be ready for defeat, ready to struggle and be defeated and yet to struggle again. The Socialist Party may perish many a time in fighting its own clean battles without pollution from the twin monsters of the age. The Socialist Party will rise again, for man will live. Victory shall belong to socialism.

8

MARXISM AND SOCIALISM*

RAMMANOHAR LOHIA

One ordinarily thinks of the ultimate, while considering a creed or a doctrine. Marxism has its ultimates. It abounds in ringing phrases about the kind of marking that will result, should this creed be put into practice; phrases like "exploitation of man by man will cease," like "the rich development of individual personality is the condition for the development of mankind." like "men will no longer be governed but that things will be administered." These are all high and ringing phrases, but if we confine our attention to such ultimates Kropotkin, Marx, Gandhi, and even Adam Smith would be one family, for they all hoped for a state of mankind in which exploitation would cease, in which peace would ensue, in which social and international reconstruction would be such that individual personality could develop.

In order, therefore, to understand a creed and more so Marxism, it would be worth our while to think more of the method or analysis of the way to the ultimate than the ultimate itself. The ultimate is the same in most doctrines as they are today. Why Marxism has acquired such fascination for a certain type of mind and also for large masses of people is due to its analysis of capitalism and the fact that this analysis irrevocably gives birth to the ultimate. There seems to be some kind of a

* Speech, Hyderabad, August 1952.

decree of fate that this will happen and nothing else can. In analyzing capitalism, Marx laid bare certain bases of human development which did not depend on anybody willing so or otherwise, could not be altered and would ultimately by themselves produce the picture that he and several others had outlined. Therein lies the peculiar fascination of Marxism, that its inevitable success does not depend upon any individual's or party's will and desires. It is inherent in the very development of capitalism to that, like a decree of fate, mankind would one day come into a stage described as communist by Marxism. The major part of Marxist doctrine is therefore precisely this development of capitalism. Certain laws of capitalist motion have been uncovered. In order, therefore, to understand Marxism it would be necessary to get a sketchy idea of what these laws of capitalist development are.

Marx starts off by saying that human labour, unlike any other commodity, has two values. It has a use-value and an exchange-value. I will try to cut out complicated expression, unless of course they are unavoidable. Human labour has two values. one which the labourer himself gets in the form of his wages and the other which the employer gets as a share in the total produce. These two are different. The labourer does not get all that he produces, and therefore there is a margin between the result of labour and the payment for it that, which is paid out to the labourer himself and that which the capitalist or employer receives for himself, the wages and the profits, and the margin is what is ordinarily called in Marxist doctrine, surplus value. Every employer of labour on account of this dichotomy between two values of labour is in a position to take away a part of the total proceeds of the labourer. With this idea of surplus value, Marx goes on to show that the capitalist in the very process of accumulating wealth, of increasing his capital, goes on to create conditions among the working class that lead to the negation of capitalism. The employer makes profits sets up new factories, newer and bigger factories. The increasing employment of capital is conducive to the growth of large mechanization in which the share of the labourer goes down and the share of the capitalist increases, with the result that on the one hand, there is enormous accumulation and concentration of capital and on the other there is increasing poverty among the labourers and also increasing socialization. These three factors are conjoint : greater and greater amassing of

capital, greater and greater socialization of labour, greater and greater poverty amongst labourers.

Marx then goes on to another law of capitalist development: that on account of increasing poverty among the working class and the fact that all that is produced cannot be sold out, precisely because the capitalist takes away a part of the produce from the labourer to himself, there is a crisis, transitional crisis of trade crisis. Apart from seasonal unemployment, there is trade depression : trade goes down, unemployment occurs, industry declines. Such industrial crises go on increasing in their rapacity until capitalism comes into a state of general crisis. From industrial crisis of a recurring character, capitalism enters into a state of general crisis, precisely because of that surplus value : not all that is produced can be sold out, and therefore depressions must needs occur. From this Marx goes on to yet another law of development, which links up also with very ringing phrases about capitalist downfall, the principle of which is than capitalism in the very process of its growth produces its own grave digger, its own invincible enemy. In the process by which capitalism advances and matures, increasing its scope and compass, in that very process capitalism produces its army of the proletariat which assembles and congregates in large numbers in big factories. There are dispossessed of wealth and property, and their general condition goes on deteriorating; therefore a state of war or struggle between the capitalist class on the one hand and the working class on the other is the inevitable outcome of capitalist development itself. Nobody has got to will it. The willing itself is almost decreed by this capitalist development. There will be persons who must will it; there will be persons who will take part in this struggle; there will be groups and parties which will come up and tell the proletariat to organise itself. It is something which just cannot be avoided because there will be an increasing and more numerous proletariat. It will socialize itself, it will also go down in its living standards and therefore capitalism will have produced its own grave-digger right throughout, until in the state of its general crisis it is struk by a fatal blow insofar as the numerous and organised proletariat is able to dispossess if of its property, of its control over means of production. Again the ringing phrase occurs, "the expropriators are expropriated."

Something must now be said about forces of production and

relations of production. Forces of production are what one might call the factories, the mechanized farms, and so on which are the result of the application of science to industry and agriculture. These numerous tools and machines of production are the result of application of science. These are the forces of production. The relations of production are the property relationships existing between employer and labourer, landlord and peasant, and so on. In the clash between the capitalist and the working class is hidden this clash between forces of production and the relations of production. Forces of production have an inevitable tendency to go on multiplying because of the continual application of science to industry, whereas relations of production put a damper on the forces of production and act as obstacles, and do not permit them to grow to their fullness because the capitalist takes away a part of the annual produce of any nation and that produces a crisis. Relations of production are an obstacle, a continuing obstacle, to the growth, an eternal or continual growth, of the forces of production, and then this clash assumes such proportions that the whole movement causes a shattering of the entire integument. Marx called it, the whole shell, covering both the relation of production and the forces of production. Then the relations of property ownership are altered fundamentally altered; new relations are established and forces of production have an easy development.

Capitalists are expropriated. Such residues as there might still be of feudalists are expropriated. The working class is enabled to take its share from the total produce without having to give a part of it away as surplus value There is no need of indurtrial and general crisis Whatever is produced in a year inside a nation is all consumed and sold out or socially invested, and therefore when these expropriators are expropriated, mankind is enabled to enter into that stage where the exploitation of man by man ceases, where the development of every individual personality is the condition for the rich development of all, where men no longer need to be governed, only things are administered. This is in rough sketch the analysis of capitalism as outlined by Marx. Is it substantially correct ? This is the core; nothing else matters. If there are some persons in India who tend to confuse Marxism with all kinds of vague and general emotive feelings about revolution, I have this to say : the essential core of Marxist doctrine is the analysis of

capitalist development and how there is a far greater force than one could find in administrative and governmental laws. With the elemented force of this sociological law of capitalism ties up the ultimate picture of society which Marx and Engels drew. Should this analysis of capitalist development be substantially correct, no matter how certain individual prophecies of Marx and Engels may have proved wrong, it affords us a sure and certain basis for our conduct and our actions and is indeed great hope for the future of mankind to which all of us can surrender such resources and power as we can command. Is it substantially correct ?

Apart from factual observations, which I do not intend to make, I would merely draw your attention to such process as that increase in pauperization among the proletariat has definitely not taken place in the capitalist countries, that, no matter how much one might have hoped for the industrial crisis to develop automatically into a state of general crisis, it has at least not so far taken place, and that, in place of the integument breaking up in advanced countries, it is doing so precisely in those areas where capitalist development is at a fairly low ebb. These are of course very deciding facts, and it would be highly ridiculous for anybody to accept to reject them offhand without trying to find out how they could be interpreted by theory that is before us.

The inherent and internal logic of this doctrine of surplus value, of class struggle, and of the ultimate revolution must be examined. This doctrine has tried to analyze capitalism as a West European entity; that is my first observation. Capitalism did indeed rise in West-Europe, grow in West Europe, and attain its full maturity there, but even while it grew it took a lot of dynamic out of territories which came under its imperialistic control but which were not part of West Europe. In order, therefore, to understand capitalist development it will be necessary to think of capitalist economy as consisting not alone of an internal circle represented by the West-European economy but of two circles, an internal West-European circle and an external world circle, from which the internal West-European circle draws its dynamic, if I were to use Marx's own phase, its surplus value its exploitation, its sucking and so on. In any case, it would be fundamentally wrong to try to analyze capitalism as a West European entity alone or as a national entity. It will have to be analyzed as a national entity which is a wider world entity and two entering into a relationship

of the exploiter and the exploited. Marx was of course very much aware of the fact that there capitalist economies of West Europe had drawn a great deal of profit from Asia and other countries of the world. This awareness is to be seen in many utterances of Marx. But in acts as an addendum to his main doctrine. It does not act as an integral part of his doctrine but somewhat like the tail of an animal.

The doctrine goes on to show that there was imperialist control and imperialist exploitation. But this imperialist control and exploitation are not so incorporated into the fundamental theory of capitalism as to give us a full and complete picture of how it developed. Capitalism, like any other sociological phenomenon, is not just an abstract entity. It is a historical phenomenon; it has to be understood in all its historical aspects. No body can deny that, if there has been surplus value, fet us say in British economy, it has not been drawn so much from the British labourer to the British capitalist as from the mass of the Indian people to the British people as a whole.

I would very much like somebody to give me a general definition of surplus value which was enunciated by Marx and Engels, and which would do justice to this vital fact, that surplus value is not an entirely abstract phenomenon or a West European phenomenon. In the historical carrer of capitalism during the past 300 or 100 years it is essentially a phenomenon which has involved such a traffic as from India and China and Malaya and Burma to England France, Germany, and like countries. Now, of course, Russia and the U.S.A. are also included in the group. This then is a major fact about capitalist development, and, this being the fact, to say that the contradiction of capitalist development lies essentially between forces of production and relations of production is inadequate and at times dangerously wrong. Such a statement without further qualification would incline men to the belief that inside every West-European economy, inside the German or the British economy, the forces of production are continually developing, factories are refining themselves mechanization is completed so that costs of production go down and so on, whereas the capitalist working class relationship again internally within the German or the British economy, is such that these factories are not continually increasing, production is not continually expanding. That would be the interpretation of the bald statement of

contradiction between forces of production and relations of production. Such, however is not the case, because capitalism as a historical entity has produced far graver contradictions between increasing forces of production in the West-European capitalist economy and decreasing forces of production in the rest of the world.

Throughout the past 300 or 400 years. West Europe as the first prime seat of capitalist economy, and the U.S.A. and Japan as later additions—one may be inclined to think it rather prepoterous to include Russia in that picture, but I provisionally include Russia not as a capitalist country but as a representative of the whole series of development of a certain civilization the modern civilization—all the countries have gone on increasing their resources of production. I will give some statistical profits the average American today has over 10,000 rupees worth of tools with which to produce wealth; the averages West-European has around 5,000 rupees worth of tools with which to produce wealth and the Indian has to do with around 150 rupees worth of tools. These three comparative statistics must be borne in mind by anybody who wishes to understand capitalist developments 10,000 rupees of America, 5,000 rupees of West Europe, and 150 rupees of India per person. This is the state of forces of production today as the result of capitalist development throughout the world in the past 300 years. West Europe, Russia, America have seen their way to apply science to industry and agriculture, to revolutionize their technology, to continue increasing their annual productivity, to keep on refining their tools with which to make human labour more productive. On the other hand, countries like India and China have had to do with tools as old as 2.000 years whether the plough and the spinning wheel or any other but let us confine ourselves to these. There has been no change in technology, and the result is perfectly obvious in the table of comparative statistics of capital resources per person.

But certain other factors of capitalist development have been common throughout the world. Population has kept on increasing. This would be an essential fact to remember. particularly if we mean intelligently to build up our country in the future. In the past 200 or 300 years, the entire world population has probably trebled. In any case, Europe has quadrupled in just one century, the 19th century. It estimates of India's population around

Akbar's days are correct, we have probably at least doubled or pretty nearly trebled, or are on the way to doing so and in another five or six years we will probably have trebled our population compared to four centuries ago. Population goes on increasing, but the tools do not increase, and therefore we live in a farcial condition in which any population of India can continually go about asking the population to put in more labour and yet more labour and produce wealth. What a fanciful notion. They have to put in more wisdom, undoubtedly. The people of Asia and Africa have got to acquire greater sense of time, be more regular, be more responsible to their work, but in what sense they have to be hard-working is difficult to know. As far as hard work goes, the people of Asia are far more hard-working with their rickshaws than any that I have known in any part of the world. It is a barbarous kind of work when man is reduced to the status of half-horse and half-man. This is the result of capitalist development in the past 300 years, that the people of Asia have been reduced to the status of half-horse and half-man.

It is not the Asoka Chakra or the Guard which is the true emblem of Asian countries and republics. Guard is the emblem of Indonesia, and the Asoka Chakra the emblem of India. If I were to give a truthful emblem for the Asian countries, I would put the Charkha and a being, half-horse and half-man, behind the Charkha. This is the true condition, graphic description, of this capitalist development in the past 300 years Forces of production have tended to decrease in two-thirds of the world, including Asia, population has tended to increase, and therefore living standards have tended to go down. An abysmal poverty prevails in this two-thirds of the world. It appears as though capitalism had made a compact with imperialism that almost all its progress would be located in the master lands, while nearly all the misery would be inflicted on the colonial countries. These colonial lands suffer the worst rigours of the Marxist laws of increasing misery and the general crisis of capitalism. Czarist Russia was never quite part of this retarded complex. It was much more part of the European complex, by virtue of race, history, and that quality of civilization which makes one group of humanity rather than another its usurper and violator, How these groups arise would seem to depend on geography religion, some parent language, colour of skin, or

similar attributes. Too many people, too little land, and a stunted equipment of production are the legacies of imperialism to the coloured world. According to my interpretation of capitalist development. Russia was a member of the ruling family, although a poor one. This was because one-third of the human race, almost all of Europe, was able somewhat to share in this capitalist development. So, although Russia was a poor relation, it was undoubtedly a member of that great community of European nations.

The revolution, the Marxist revolution, occured in Russia, therefore Trotsky gave an explanation and came out with the graphic remark that the capitalist chain broke at its weakest point. One Marxist, Marx himself, says that it will break at its strongest point, and another Marxist, called Trotsky, says that is breaks at its weakest point. Lenin, probably because he was a politician, was far more clever then these and therefore gave an answer which is liable to various interpretations according to the situation. He said that the capitalist chain would snap wherever the political party of the proletariat is effective, whether it is the strongest link, the weakest link, middle link, or any other link. These three great Marxists outline three different laws of capitalist development and of where the chain of capitalist civilization will snap.

It does not in the least matter what particular, specific country each one of them might have mentioned in the course of his writings. It is quite clear that in 10,000 pages or 8,000 pages that Marx of Engels or Lenin might have written there would be reference to all kinds of places. Every great man has made contradictory utterances in relation to the specific; so did Mahatama Gandhi; so did Karl Marx It is not the contradictory utterances that should engage our attention or demand our special claim but the whole process of capitalist development the law itself. How the law is specifically applied by Marx or Trotsky or Stalin can indeed be a matter of enlightenment, but the law very definitely and irrevocably lays down that capitalism in the very process of its development gives rise to its own economy. It produces its own grave digger, and while it goes on increasing its domain it is also expanding the army of the proletariat, which is one day destroy it. That is the law. It would not do for anyone to point out a passage from Karl Marx and say, look, Karl Marx himself prophesied that the revolution might occur in Soviet

Russia, or any other passage from Lenin to show that the revolution might occur in India. These passages are immaterial, valueless, thoroughly useless.

What matters is the law, because unless we get hold of this precise law of chpitalist development all that strange fascination which Marxist doctrine has exercised upon the minds of the youth and others all over the world goes, for the decree of fate ceases to be. This decree does not depend on man's willing or deciding not to will. It does not depend upon whether certain mental process emerge or do not. It is a decree of fate. It is a decree of capitalist development that, in the very process of its growth, it must kill itself. The killing takes place because concentratson of capital and socialization of labour are joined and, together with that, increasing poverty. It is the joint appearance of three phenomena that enable Marx to lay down this fundamental law of revolution and to say that the capitalist chain would snap at its strongest point, which is evidently a total error. If I were a Marxist, I would try to refurbish this theory, to equip it with the recent additions to knowledge.

The three phenomena which Marx described have indeed manifested themselves, for nobody can doubt that concentration of capital and socialization of labour and increasing poverty have all manifested themselves, but Marx went wrong in thinking that all the three phenomena would manifest themselves inside a single economy, let us say the British or the German economy. The time to disjoin the three phenomena has come so that the two phenomena of concentration of capital and socialization of labour manifest themselves in the West-European and American economies, and the phenomenon of increasing poverty manifests itself in the retarded economies, in the two kinds of the world. With this correction of the Marxist analysis of capitalist development. I could conclude easily that the shattering of capitalist civilization will take place in those areas where poverty has kept on increasing. But, as I said, if I were a Marxist I would make such an attempt, and I therefore leave it to any Marxist in India or outside to do so Anyhow, while analyzing the laws of capitalist development, it is perfectly clear that we will have to consider anew the law of surplus value, the contradictions of capitalism, and the law regarding revolution, and therefore our entire strategy and tactics will also have to be revised, because the strategy and

tactics of Marxism are the inevitable outcome of this law of capitalist development.

After having come to the conclusion that capitalist civilization will shatter in the areas of advanced economies, Marx had nothing else to worry about. The forces of expending production would be there; all that one would need to do is remove the capitalist and establish social ownership. Factories would be there. All the necessary ingredients of an advanced economy would be there, the only thing necessary, that is, the removal of capitalist control, would have been done. After social ownership was established, the economy would go on advancing and satisfying the needs of the people. But, as this law of capitalist development has been substantially wrong. and as there is the possibility of the capitalist chain snapping not to the area where the forces of production have advanced but in the area where the forces of production have been stunted and dwarfed an entirely new thinking becomes necessary.

To take a hypothesis, let us say that the capitalist chain snaps in India. What does one work with one hundred and fifty rupees worth of tools per worker; that is the entire capital resources that we have at our disposal. I would also emphasize the conditions obtaining with regard to agricultural land. After the removal of capitalist control over the Indian economy, we would come face to face with problems which have not at all been digested by Marxist theory, because to Marxist theory, no problem exists after capitalist control has been removed. According to it, the whole thing would just develop, whereas with the capitalist chain snapping in a backward country any number of problems arise. A consistent, worthwhile sociological or economic theory must be able to face these problems and digest them in order that society may be reconstructed. After all, with the removal of capitalist control, what do we have in India ? Once again, 150 rupees worth of tools per person, and these tools would have to be increased to considerable size if we wanted the same standard of living as America and Russia. What would that mean ? If the people of India were to have the capital investment of America or Russia, we would have to multiply a possible 20 crore jobs with the investment of Rs. 10,000 for each job. That comes to 200,000 crores or Rs. 2.000 billion. Even if we assume a lower cpaitalization of Rs. 5.000 per worker, we would still need Rs. 1,000 billion.

Contrast this figure with the paltry sums available to us under the First Five Year Plan in India. It works out at 18 billion or 25 billion rupees for five years, three or five billion per year, and we would have to make a total investment of Rs. one to two thousand billion. How many years would we require ? It roughly works out at more than 200 years. Let us assume that the rate of development which Congress India will later he able to achieve is larger and the multiplier factor comes into operation; we would still need a hundred years or 80. The whole thing is so absurd. Any intelligent man would laugh it out.

Assume now for a moment that a more ruthless system, a more conscious system, came into existence which was aware of what it wanted and which had already come to grips with modern civilization in such a fashion that it was enamoured of it. Let us imagine that the Communist Party came into power. What would be its rate of development of capital resources, considering the very small margin, in fact, none at all, as far as the broad masses of the population are concerned, that exists between the bare minimum sustenance and wages or earnings ? No matter what ruthless political system one might introduce in this country, it would not be possible to think in terms of an annual capital investment that goes beyond ten billion rupees, that is, in terms of present prices. I assume that a ruthless system would be determined to exterminate ten million or 20 million or 50 million persons. When persons think of building up new societies and civilizations there is none more cruel than the religious person and none more cruel than the political person, because they are both infatuated with an ideal and while working out that ideal, they just do not consider the cost. Therefore, I am prepared to admit that the Communist Party might be able to achieve a doubling or trebling of the rate of investment. What would that mean ? Eighty years, I suppose, or the multiplier factor may accelerate : it might mean 60 years. That is the utmost. You just cannot go beyond that. Sixty or 70 years under the most ruthless system which exterminates and does not think twice before killing 10 or 20 or 50 million persons. Meanwhile, how much further would the advanced economies of Russia or America have marched ?

I do not know what the Socialist Party would behave like supposing it came into power. Supposing the men ruling the country at that time were similarly infaturated with modern ideals, as

they are called, and try to practice the Russian or American system; they also would go the Congress or Communist way although they would not be perhaps so ruthless. Perhaps they are not capable of being ruthless, and therefore I do not expect that they would do very much better than the Communists because they would not be so ruthless. Their capital investment with the help of voluntary labour might be able to reach a figure of five or ten billion at least in the initial stages when the mass of the population would be willing to give its voluntary labour of an hour a day and so forth.

The entire absurdity of bringing up two-thirds of the world to the living standards, to the production equipment of one-third of the world is apparent, add I have given the statistical proofs. For anyone to neglect this fact, this fundamental phenomenon of capital development of the past 300 years, would be suicidal, particularly for the Asian, African, or South American Capitilism and imperialism have been twins. Imperialism has not been the last stage of capitalism, as somebody said, but they have been twins; they were born together, they rose together, they matured together and in all the history of the world I have not come across a greater scoundrel than capitalism or imperialism, who having been born as twins and having matured as twins have brought the world to this pass, where America and Russia and West Europe work with 5,000 or 10,000 rupees worth of tools per person while India, Burma, and Malaya and the rest have to content themselves with tools worth 150 or 300 rupees. This is capitalist development, and therefore it is quite obvious that the strategy and the manner of revolution and class struggle will have to be thought out afresh.

I should at this stage speak of what I have felt to be the fascinating features of Marxism. As a young man I might of course have been fascinated by other features as well, but today what I feel to be the absorbing feature of Marxism is that any one who has made a consistent study of this doctrine and who has seen his way to accept it will get rid of love of property. That is a very fascinating feature, a feature which sometimes makes a powerful appeal also to essentially religious people. It is, so to say, an exercise in the sphere of non-attachment. It may well be that a person deeply versed in Marxism and having become infatuated with it may be a devil in other spheres, a betrayer, a

falsifire, may engage in crude conduct, may be deceitful, tell lies, commit murder, but he will not be fascinated by private property, and that is its greatest quality. To have given us loathing of wealth, at least insofar as it entails employment of other persons, is no mean achievement, and therefore in the background of history I would call this the greatest achievement of Marxism, that it enables a person automatically and without any course of self-discipline to acquire a state of mind in which property is no fascination.

Marxism is a *Nachtketa* who automatically spurns gold. The doctrine may not be able to spurn song, nor beauty, nor sceptre, and who would want it to spurn song, nor beauty, but without doubt it spurns gold. That is its fascination.

Let us now go on to examine laws of development, which are certainly not automative. If after having made a comparative study of statistics of India and also of what a system of development on Marxist lines would entail, we came to the conclusion that the whole thing was absurd, where do we go from there ? How could it be done ? Or have we get to reconcile ourselves to the fact that it just cannot be done ? All manner of problems arise, and I know of nothing in the Marxist doctrine that can answer these problems. What is it that will enable this two-thirds of the world to bring up its living standards to a condition of decency ? Before I continue with this, let me state that even a period of 70 or 80 years, which I thought would be necessary for a ruthless system, would not be able to achieve this wonder for Asia. That was merely a mathematical calculation because during these 80 years, when a ruthless system would exterminate sections of its own population, rationalize one sector and leave another sector depressed, such tensions would arise that the system would be incapable of infusing any new spirit or dynamic among its people. That holds also of capitalism and such of its expressions as the Congress Party. Therefore, when I talked of 80 years, let no one imagine that communism or socialism or capitalism can accomplish this wonder for India even after 80 years. There would be such storm and stress and tension and rivalry between rationalized and unrationalized sectors that murder and all that would follow, total destruction of the State, would perhaps be the inevitable outcome.

I do not see it as possible that Asia and Africa and the rest

of two-thirds of the world can build up a civilization on the lines of Western Europe. On the premise of an unlikely, marginal, or calamitous development, if that may be assumed, the premise would have to include a further assumption that Europe and North America slide into obscurity or neglest. A total repetition would be enacted. Mankind would not benefit by such a historical development. In the game of see-saw or domination, the coloured boy would be up and the white one down. Capitalism in the past 300 or 400 years has been a historical phenomenon. It is dying out. It did its work. Its work was shabby but very clever, To the European part of mankind its work brought some relief, and with that ties up another inadequacy of Marxism. Marxists say that capitalism brought progress to mankind up to a phase in history and it has ceased to do so now. It was progressive at one time and it has become reactionary now. Such a proposition is the inevitable outcome of that faulty analysis of capitalist development which Marxism makes. With a correct analysis of capitalist development the statement would be : capitalism brought great progress to the European part of mankind in the past but is on the point of ceasing to do so today. To the rest of mankind, it never brought any progress . On account of this initial mistake of having regarded the world economy as a single entity and not having regarded it as consisting of two circles. an outer and an inner, such blatantly wrong statements continue to be made. Additionally, I find it utterly fanciful that a colonial or Asian should go about proclaiming that grotesque theory about imperialism being the last stage of capitalism when he knows fully well that the two were born as twins and have matured as twins.

What now ? Science as applied to industry and agriculture need not necessarily be of the existing variety. Capitalization need necessarily rise up to the standards in U.S.A. or U.S.S.R. and keep on rising. New tools may have to be invented and manufactured. I think of an economy in which the capitalization per worker will not rise up to the standards of America or Russia, will also not remain at the low point of India, but will rise up sufficiently so as to enable a decent living without the specific strains of rationalization and unrationalization. Such capitalization, for purposes of very rough and ready calculations, might be put at 1,000 rupees per worker. Let us now assume that we

have 10 billion rupees worth of capital available for annual investment. On the basis of standards of rationalization as they exist in Russia or America, we would be able to give employment, rational employment, to one million persons, where as if we were to operate on the basis of a technology which does not demand such a high capitalization, and works out roughly at 1,000 rupees worth of tools per person, we would be able to give rational employment to ten million persons. With a lower capitalization, with a tool that will make an advance upon the existing situation but will not make such crushing demands upon our general economy as to cause dislocations, as to give the benefits of rationalization only to a small sector and to deny it to the rest, it would be possible to re-equip the economy of two-thirds of the world whom capitalism has ravaged in the course of its history.

This tool is to some extent available. At any rate, some of its manifestations are there. It is not abundantly available. Many such tools will have to be invented and manufactured, Some persons may say at this stage; look at this politician trying to tell inventors, scientists, engineers, and technicians what to do. I quite agree that no politician has the right or should ever leave the right to tell a fundamental scientist about the line of his research. I certainly would not tell a theoretical physicist how to inquire into the atom or to make mathematical calculations of space. That would not only be arrogant but also utterly stupid. But a student of economics and politics and particularly an administrator in control of the destiny of the country would be definitely entitled to tell technicians and engineers to try to invent certain types of machines. After all, inventions have not proceeded at the sweet will of scientists and technicians. They have been commanded. A continual refinement takes place in the laboratories of manufactures. I do not see why a Bureau of Scientific Management which spends a whole lot of money on futile investigations should not be entrusted with job of inventing for us precisely these small-unit machines.

The continuing application of science to industry and agriculture in the white lands, which have in the last four centuries never been conquered and occupied in the manner of the colonial peoples and whose increases of population have coincided with expansions of the productive equipment, has brought them prosperity and power. To America for a long time and to Russia

now, the objective reality of an expending output and the subjective temptation of a rising standard of living have given a man who is in major aspects alike. This economic exercise must have given final proof of my theroy, which finds little difference between Mr. Ford and Mr. Stalin, between capitalism and communism. As far as the current instant of man's brief sojourn on earth is concerned, both of them belong to a single complex of civilization, although they are at the moment entered in a mortal combat. Russia seems to have made good, at least partially. She is the second strongest power in the world today. Not that she was not in earlier times. Students of history are inclined to forget that a Russian Czar by the name of Alexander could go about Europe like its master. Russia has not been quite so weak even in past times but, assuming for a moment that this was a miracle which Communism or the doctrine of Marx wrought, it indeed has an overpowering effect on the human mind and particularly that mind which one finds in the underdeveloped areas, because that mind begins to think that if Russia could do it with Marxism, why can't we do it ? If Russia was able to come up to agricultural and industrial standards approximating the American, why can't we do it in India or China ? The figures about Russia, the low density of their population, namely, 20 persons per square mile, the higher agricultnral acreage, and the fact that their steel production under the Czar was very much higher than ours is today and not at all so low compared to the then European or American, would seem to indicate that Russia was a poor relation of the European complex of civilization, but she was its member. She could do it. But with the density of population in India, which is over 300 persons per square mile, or the Chinese density, although that is less than half of India, even assuming the greatest amount of ruthlessness, could that be done? But, the human mind is frail. It thinks in terms of images. It sees the image of Russia, and therefore if it finds that capitalism is totally unable to solve the economic problem in Asia, it rushes to the Russian method and believes that it might be able to do in India or China what Russia did.

Apart from involving a great deal of cruelty and great coarsening of the human mind, these facts make it perfectly clear that the system must inevitably fail. In India or China, though a little less so, any consistent application of the Marxist doctrine,

with its destruction of relationships of capitalism but pursuit of the same forces of production which capitalism had made use of, must inevitably lead to disaster. Russia at any rate trod the path of sin and achieved pleasure and success, and success is in itself virtue, because people are inclined to forget all the sins that might have been committed in the passage. If India should ever choose to tread this path of sin, the end of it will not alone be cruelty but also Failure. In India, any attempt whether under communism or socialism or capitalism to achieve the modern civilization which the world has known for the past 300 years must result in barren cruelty, cruelty which knows no success.

If one were now to make a distinction between Marxism and socialism, so far as this analysis is concerned one would have to admit that Marxism and communism construe their task by one-half. They think alone in terms of destroying the relations of capitalist production, whereas a genuine socialism would have to think in terms of destroying both the capitalist relations of production and the capitalist forces of production, or at least vastly remodelling them. It would have to think of a society and a civilization in which the worker and the agriculturist and the other professions will be equipped with tools with which they could produce more wealth and yet not succumb either to the subjective temptation or to the objective reality of a continually increasing standard of living. The socialist therefore has got to carry out two tasks at the same time. The Communist carries out only one task; he destroys the capitalist class, and then there is an end to the matter, whereas the Socialist will have to destroy the capitalist class as well as destroy the methods of production which capitalism has given to the world. It is a two-fold task.

Inevitably, this two-fold task brings all kinds of difficulties and dangers, and also frames a totally different orientation to the class struggle. With the Communists, class struggle is an easy matter; there is just one aim, and single-mindedly one can pursue that aim, which is, to destroy the capitalist class. Whether in the execution of that specific aim any general aims of society are sacrificed is no consideration to the Communist or the Marxist. I do not have to produce any evidence for it; it is there. In fact, all these people were honest enough, as far as their theory went, and in their theory they honestly confessed that deceit and lying and killing are essential and necessary instsuments when they further

the cause of the Revolution. The actual killing and lying that these people are engaged in assumes a more heinous aspect in view of their basic doctrine that the greatest and all-devouring virtue for them is the revolution. Once the revolution occurs, everything purifies itself and improves itself. Destroy the capitalist relations of property and man improves and exploitation ceases, things get administered, and the golden age is ushered in. In order to usher in that golden age which is of great morals and high virtues and also individual values, should it be necessary to tell lies and commit murder, that would only be in furtherance of the great and noble aim and therefore justified. All ethics are relative; there is nothing absolute. It is perfectly justifiable to achieve the world revolution in whatever way one may find it necessary, and therefore Lenin has very clearly spoken in favour of force and duplicity, which Marx did not.

Marx, because of his general theory of capitalism, stayed a democrat throughout. Essentially and fundamentally that was the nature of his mind, because he was thinking in terms of his theory, and his theory said that the revolution would occur in countries of advanced forces of production. He did not have to think of what economically may be called barbarous and retarded countries or those semi-barbarous and semi-retarded nations like India, Russia, and China. He thought in terms of England and Germany where this revolution was expected to occur, where democratic processes would continue and deepen. Although Marx may have occassionally talked in terms of force, he did not outline the whole strategy and tactic of deceit and lies and bad conduct which Lenin did, perhaps because he had to operate in conditions of backwardness. Lenin was a great man; in a historical sense these men are great. He operated in conditions which were entirely different and dissimilar, and therefore in the service of the revolution he called upon its votaries to engage in deceit. Such are his words, to work parliamentary institutions with a view to destroy them, to tell lies with a view to achieve the success of the working class, and not to talk, not to think of incidental killing and murder. If it were at all possible to continue thinking of that kind of class struggle, but if the result be barren cruelty, how justified was I sin saying we will have trodden the path of sin without pleasure One is sometimes inclined to be quite sinful, if one finds success or pleasure awaiting one.

Without success at the end of it, if all these tactics of employing what are known as evil means become a necessary part of the revolution and of the class struggle, one must think afresh of a general theory of capitalist development and of a class struggle, which incorporates the principle of immediacy. The principle of class struggle as outlined by Karl Marx did not incorporate immediacy. He was thinking in terms of class struggle as obtaining in Germany and England. He did not busy himself with a class struggle such as may obtain in India or China. Now that we have to think about it, we must seriously examine whether it is worth our while to combat the general aims of society in the process of wanting to achieve an economic aim which is destined to turn into a mirage.

We must here concern ourselves with the rift between the general aims of society and the economic aims of society. No such rift is discernible in the doctrine of Marx, because it is an automotive doctrine, but base on wrong economic premises. If the doctrine were economically sustainable, one could at least say that no matter what one did in the process, at the end of it, with the achievement of an economic society where exploitation of man by man ceases, one would also have achieved a society in which truth and good conduct and peaceful neighbourliness prevail. These are the general aims of society, democracy, truthfulness, good conduct, peace of the heart and of the world, and so forth, and a general state of culture. These general aims of society would automatically flourish once the economic aims of communism or socialism were achieved; so said Marx. But as the economic aims of society, which are outlined by communism or Marxian socialism are incapable of fruition in two-thirds of the world, it would be extremely risky and stupid to go on pursuing the illusory economic aims and also sacrificing the general aims. That would be a kind of activity in which because of sheer ignorance one definitely sacrifices one particular aspect of the good, falsely hoping that with the achievement of another aspect that sacrificed will be reborn. Even apart from the fact that a general refining of the economic theory is necessary, an integrated theory which deals with general aims and economic aims separately is required.

Perhaps with the small-unit tool it would be possible for countries like India to re-equip their economy, to expand their

productive equipment. But in order to achieve that condition, what kind of class struggle do we have to wage ? Would it be permissible for us to go through all that pathway of deceit and lies ? Obviously not. I do not intend to produce an ethical argument in order to sustain my theory. I produce a specifically economic argument because at the end of having pursued all these tactics lies failure, a specifically secular, unethical, and what some might call a thoroughly cruel argument, that I do not propose to tell lies because I cannot succeed and produce results, I do not propose to kill or murder because at the end of it I cannot succeed in achieving that new economy. This is my first argument, although not the only argument. I am not quite that cruel.

It is useless to ask the Communist not to tell lies; it is useless to tell him not to engage in a conduct of deceit. He thinks himself superior to the one who goes about lecturing to him on good conduct because he has already given himself in service to a high and noble ideal as he construes it.

A similar phenomenon appears in the religious field, where in the service of a diety and God that one loves or worships one in prepared to do all that is gross, and evil. Did not Krishna, the Godhead, undertake all the vile acts of lies and deceit and killing, and has not Indian humanity ever looked upon him as its greatest lower and sage, because he did everything in the selfless service of truth and love ? The Communist believes that he lies in the service of truth, that he murders in the service of health, that he destroys democracy in order to have world revolution, that he sacrifices the freedom of nations in order to achieve the unity of the world's working classes. In the service of of his noble and high ideals, he descends according to our language, into the bottomless pit of dark and deceitful conduct, but he just cannot see it that way. He thinks that his methods are a necessary part of his rise to what others would one day call spiritual height and eminence. And therefore to engage in any kind of debate with a Communist or a Marxist about ethics and morals is thoroughly stupid. If a Communist can be shown that his conduct of deceit will not be rewarded, he will probably begin to see reason. And these vital economic arguments have already been advanced that if Indian should ever try to pursue the Marxist path failure lies at the end of it, because of the agricultural and industrial and

economic bases that now exist.

I have often in the past been condemned by the Communists of India for being an American agent and so on and for having accepted American dollars. Once or twice out of sheer irritation I may have answered that charge and made the true counter-accusation about his acceptance of Russian and Chinese money in cash and kind. When I am more at peace with myself, I know that the Communist has got to tell this lie in order to further the world revolution, as he conceives it If he believes that he can by telling such a lie destroy the base of the Socialist Party, he has done an enourmously good act, and there the matter ends. And so it goes on, and therefore to combat a communist lie by trying to answer it each time is utter futility because they will at once skip on to another lie and there will be no end to that game. It is part of their tactic in furtherance of the revolution, in furtherance of the great aim of society.

A class struggle which would be the consonance with the analysis of capitalist development here made must justify and incorporate the principle of immediacy; every single act in that class stuggle must be justifiable in itself. Not through lies are we to serve truth, not through murder are we to serve health. If the socialist ideology in India and elsewhere were to give expression consistently and also aggressively to a principle of class struggle where every act would be justifiable in itself, the socialist class struggle would then be able to fascinate men's minds. At the moment there are two types of class struggle, of which the communist type which is a continuation and also to some extent a distortion of Marxism, is one. The socialist class struggle should not in the least reduce the aggressive character of revolutionary activity. It must be aggressive. If non-violence should ever come to mean abandonment or easing of the struggle, it would be but a cover for bestial violence. This is the difficulty. People who adopt the principle of immediacy are generally also inclined to be soft and compromising and tend to make adjustments. What is needed now is that new type of individual in India who would be aggressive and sharp, who might make mistakes in struggling against capitailsm and feudailsm and the existing governments, who would not care overmuch about what he undergoes, but who would ensure that every single act of his class struggle is justifiable in itself. The strike, civil disobedience, violation of laws, and

even the possession and seizure of lands by enormous masses of people should be conducted in such a fashion as not to entail the telling of lies and the committing of murder.

This new type of class struggle is consonant with the true theory of capitalist development. The older type, as it grew out of a mistaken theory, must be scrapped, and the general aims of society and the economic aims of society must over be thought of separately. Undoubtedly, the economic and general aims of society have to be brought into a harmony. To superimpose the one on the other would lead to disaster; they must be pruned and sheared and also altered with a view to integration. Some baby-socialists and Gandhites seem to think that the sole difference between Communism and Gandhism or Socialism lies in the practice or otherwise of non-violence of democracy. So, the difference between Communism and Gandhism or democratism is so narrowed down that into the entire elaborate theory of Communism or Marxism one could somehow incorporate the Gandhian theory of non-violence or the liberal theory of democratism and superimpose the Gandhian practice of non-violence or the West-European practice of democracy upon this theory of capitalist development, of class struggle, of world revolution and the new civilization. How ridiculous, patently ridiculous, that is in view of the basic doctrine here outlined of joint imperialist-capitalist development of concentration of capital taking place in imperialist centres and misery, crises and struggles in the colonies or retarded areas of expansion of forces of production in Euro-America but upsurge for new relations of production in Afro-Asia. To superimpose a theory of non-violence or even a theory of democracy upon Marxist or communist economic theory would be worse than stupid. Indian socialism has long suffered from this grievous malady of trying to superimpose one item of the democratic or Gandhian faith upon another item of the communist or Marxist faith. With such a futile endeavour, where the human mind reduces itself to the making of ugly and useless ropes of thought to picking one strand from Marxism and another from Gandhism, socialism should have nothing further to do.

Such superimpositions of one ideal upon another have before been attempted by man with grievous results. The two must be interwoven in harmonious fashion, interwoven so that the economic structure admits of realizing general aims and the general aims

of society are in turn so construed that they can sustain the economic structure. Another great pitfall must be uncovered. Not alone Socialists and Communists but also democrats and Gandhians seem to imagine that they can somehow impose individual values, cultural traits, and the good conduct of life upon any kind of economy that exists. There are persons who imagine that one can have a capitalist system functioning with its enormous factories and yet have democracy and good conduct and moral and ethical values, which they now call the values of culture. That is wholly absurd. Such an attitude would result in the reduction of Mahatma Gandhi to a ceremonial mention and reference. Once we permit an economic structure to go along with its basis and motivations, it is idle to think in terms of superimposing a set of values contradictory to it upon it. No matter how forcible the appeal of a moral teacher may be, it just cannot be done. One cannot transform thousands and hundreds of thousands of capitalists into trustees.

Another law of capitalist development may be indicated. It was not in England that increasing poverty took place, but actually in India, while riches and wealth expanded in England. Inequality and poverty go alongside. According to the Marxist doctrine, riches and poverty should go alongside; in a single region or country, fabulous riches and abysmal poverty should exist side by side. According to the law of capitalist development here outlined, it is easy to understand that the riches a country has become under the capitalist civilization, the narrower is its scope of inequality; the poorer a country has become the wider is its scope of inequality. The poorer country nourishes a small minority of rich or powerful people, who are well-versed in appropriating the comforts of modernization in the name of the high ideal of national renovation. There is far greater inequality in India and such like countries than there is in America and England or elsewhere. Such inequalities result in deadening of individual and social conscience. The mind fails when it has to bear a load beyond its capacity, Continual sight of misery, and unseeable misery, makes the mind wrap up a cover around itself, so that it may not see, almost in the fashion of the oyster around the grain of sand in its belly. Then this misery and the deadening of mind or conscience act and react upon each other; they feed upon each other and grow. That is one reason why revolution in the Afro-Asian countries and in

South America concerns itself more with abstract phrases than concrete realities, for the phrases still offer some hope, while the realities turn men mad.

Marxism is a continuation of such old religious thought as awakens fear or dislike of private property but there is an essential difference. While such old religious thought concerned itself with the mind of the individual and tried to put into it contempt or dislike of private property, the new Marxist thought strives to abolish private property and to achieve a society in which no man shall possess wealth such as may employ another. Religious thought, particularly like the *Isopanisad's*, abolishes private property subjectively; Marxism abolishes it objectively. As long as the objective reality of property continues to exist, religious thought, at least in its social consequences as distinct from its emotional consequences, can only act as an amendment, and a poor one at that. As long as the emotional lure of private property exists, Marxism or any similar social doctrine will be continually at war with its own handiwork. Private property may be abolished in a major way, but the desire for unequal comfort or show will continually make erosions on the social order. Aside from the sociological and economic errors of the Marxist doctrine already pointed out, its great achievement towards objective abolition of private property must be recorded and hope maintained for the spread of a yet higher doctrine which abolishes private property as much in the mind as objectively and which bases itself on the conjoint improvement of enviroment and the individual.

9

SOCIALIST SELF CRITICISM

RAMMANOHAR LOHIA

Talking of the arts of statesmanship, Prof. Harold Laski somewhere enumerates them to be : (1) the art of handling men, (2) the understanding of the issues which need handling, (3) the discovery of the priority or comparative importance of these issues, and (4) the art of the use of available resources for working out the proposed solutions.

The art of handling men, properly speaking, forms part of the economy of resources. No doubt, a Party, to be effective politically, must be able to assess fully the nature and extent of the available means in order not so to skyscrape its objects as to render them largely into paper schemes.

With the proviso, therefore, that impossible plans shall not be proposed, the premier test of the success or otherwise of a Party is its programme. What is a programme ? Laski has given us the answer. It is the vision to put the finger unerringly upon the problems which need handling, to work out the issues to be faced after a close study of the facts of a particular situation and, not a whit less, to discover the degree of importance that attaches to each of these issues, to catalogue these in the order of their merit.

Has the Congress Socialist Party succeeded ? Has it been able to master the facts of the situation obtaining in the country today ? or, what are the issues on which it is trying to concentrate popular agitation ? Which is, in its judgment the basic national problem, the basic national activity, upon which the rest has its

being ?

The problems which the Party has tried, during the past one year or so, to raise before the country are obvious even to a mild student of Indian politics. They are :—(1) The fact of the New Constitution and, together with it, the issue of acceptance *v.* non-acceptance of offices. (2) Movement for Trade Union unity and campaign to unionise the unorganised workers. (3) Declaration of a sound anti-imperialist policy and consequential changes in the Congress constitution and programme. (4) Militant agrarian policy. (5) Suppression of civil liberties. (6) Imperialist war and India's duty. (7) Imperialism—Capitalism *v.* Socialism. (8) Youth movement, unemployment etc.

The statement of issues is not yet in the order of comparative importance which the Party has attached to each and the above numbering should not occasion any such misunderstanding.

When drawing up a programme of problems and issues, the first question that needs answering is, are these, the problems and issues, such as bear a direct relation to the needs of the masses ? Are these suited to awaken in the people an intense desire for freedom as also to give it a broad perspective of the struggle that is ahead ? Do these problems, even while they are raised, prepare the masses organisationally ? And, have we not, in our haste or prejudice, overlooked or dismissed a problem, an issue, better calculated to arouse and organise the masses ?

No one conversant with the facts of our political life, the facts of agriculture and industry in our country, will doubt that the programme or issues that the Party has framed could not have been improved upon. Whather ideologically, emotionally or organisationally, which are, as we have seen, the three necessary facets of a programme of problems, the eight issues that the Party has framed are absolutely exhaustive, suitable, such as make a direct approach to the masses.

There is, however, one thing to which the Party must draw the specific attention of its members, the composite character of its programme of problems. Party members, it appears, are not conscious, to the extent they ought to be, of the Promethean, the gigantic, character of the programme, and its component parts, that the Party has given them. The chains have to be sledge-hammered all over, a variation of emphasis is no doubt necessary, but an entire neglect of any one issue is calculated to bring harm.

Before long, every provincial party must be able to say that it has fought the fight on all fronts.

Talking of the variation of emphasis, we are reminded of another question. Which is, in the Party's programme, the basic national problem, the basic national activity? From what happened at the Lucknow Congress, the time taken up and the heat shown in the discussion of the various resolutions and the nature of Party propaganda in the press and on the platform, the problem of wrecking the new Constitution or the issue of acceptance *v.* non-acceptance of offices, seems to have been the Party's anchorsheet. Was it correct? Does that position still hold good?

There is no doubt that a militant agrarian policy, working-class activity or the organised struggle of the unemployed, would bear a more direct relation to the needs of the masses. Any one of these issues would be more easily understood by them. In comparison, a controversy around the new Constitution would appear to them involved and far-away. Further, even while the agrarian, working-class or the unemployment issues are raised, the mass of the people, the peasantry, the workers and the revolutionary lower middle-class, would be prepared organisationally. The Party could, through these organisations, draw revolutionary recruits. gain strength, inspire confidence in the masses and, finally, establish its leadership over the coming struggle.

The problem of the acceptance or non-acceptance of offices, in comparison, seems to lack signally either in the capacity to organise the masses or to establish a correct ideological leadership over them. Wherein does its significance lie? Its value, obviously, is mainly emotional, party ideological.

The constitutional issue is instinct with an emotional significance owing largely to the character of our vocal elements. Anti-imperialism to the large majority of the professions, the smaller landlords, the clergy and the intelligentsia, has up-til-now been a question of emotions, a question of "my heart is in it or against it." It is these elements which decided the Lucknow Congress and which decide, what is usually known, as the country's political lead. To them any controversy around a militant economic programme would have appeared involved and far-away; at least, its relation with the political fight would have been lost on them. By meeting them on their own ground, the ground of emotional anti-imperialism and constitutional issues,

the Party has become known, even if opposed. It has become known, to an extent, even to the masses, for it is an unhappy fact in politics that the masses take their due from the existing leadership till a new claimant throws it an effective challenge. No more effective challenge could have been devised than to predominate the constitutional issue.

To have raised the problem of offices is also to have achieved, in part, ideological clarity. I am not referring here to the much-talked-of cleavage between a revolutionary and a reformist mentality. Be that as it may, one thing is obvious, and that is the difference in the outlook of the pro-ministerialists and the anti-ministerialists in their estimate and evaluation of the country's political forces. The pro-ministerialists are suspicious, the anti-ministerialists are confident the former believe that the struggle is yet distant, while the latter declare that it is there and a wise statesmanship would at once engage in increasing its tempo to the final degree.

It has now become easier to talk to the country about the new type of struggle and how to force its pace. Lucknow Congress had to be, and rightly so, a session on the new Government of India Act in order that Poona may have the chance to thrash out intelligently a militant economic programme, a method of working-class and agrarian struggles

Now is the time to prepare for the working out of the Party's parliamentary policy enunciated as far back as October, 1934 at its Bombay Conference If parliamentary activity is to be a reflex of action in the country outside, we must look to it that action is there, that fighting and well-knit organisations of the masses have come into existence. It should be beyond dispute that a one-day strike of workers, both in factory and on field, at the inauguration of the new Constitution will do more to imprees the Poona Congress and the country than anything else we might do.

In particular, something dramatic should be done to concentrate popular attention on the agrarian issue. It does not need to be an expert on statistics to realise the miserable condition of our peasantry. A famine of any considerable extent—and its periodic probability is not at all remote—would see corpses lying on the streets and the wayside. The peasantry, it must not be forgotten, is left without any reserves.

In passing, let me mention that the organisations of workers

and peasants under the Party's control will be a splended reservoir for the enrolment of Congress members.

We have committed no mistake, but we may be on the threshhold of one. No doubt, the unfinished battle of Lucknow may yet have to be fought out at Poona. But unless we can raise the agrarian and the working-class issues to, at least, an equal eminence, we will have shown ourselves lacking in an important art of statesmanship. The arguments which did not apply at Lucknow will largely hold good at Poona.

10

STATEMENT OF PRINCIPLES*

RAMMANOHAR LOHIA

Five thousand years of Indian history and more have now matured to a climax, and the fate of world capitalism is also twined with it. On the one hand are the forces of working men, peasants on the field and labourers in the factories and whole masses of working middle classes of teachers, traders, physicians, clerks, and the like, whose sense for duties will grow only as they awaken to their rights and who are beginning to struggle for the overthrow of the system in which power of money or of administration is held by a few and where indolence sometimes pays more than work; and, on the other, are feudal and capitalist class assisted by anachronistic elements of an old civilization.

The system of castes, which has made private beggary more honourable than mannual work, and the theory of Kaıma, which seeks deliverance from new action although it is well aware that the accumulation of past deeds has to be worked out, have both erected a civilization in which indolence of action is far easier to attain than the severe discipline of contemplation. A bureaucratic capitalism has further heightened the disease. While returns on speculative and commercial deals continue to be far more important than those of industrial or agricultural production, the government apparatus grows interminably, and it functions more to preach and to teach and to regulate or interfere and generally

* Statement of Principles of the Socialist Party adopted at its Foundation Conference, Hyderabad, January 1956.

to provide partisan employment than to produce. The remnants of civilization overwhelmingly middle class and supervisory have been further sterilized by a bureaucratic and feudal capitalism.

World capitalism has, like a knife, run through humanity and cut it up into those generally living north of the thirtieth parallel, beneficiaries of the existing civilization, and those living south of it, the disinherited of the earth. While it has engendered the clash between owners of concentrated capital and their native proletarians, the clash between forces of production and relations of production, it has also produced the graver contradiction between massive means of production over one-third of the earth and the decaying apparatus of production over the rest. Capitalism imposed the peace of death on Asia and Africa and elsewhere, caused their populations to grow and their economic apparatus to decay. The task of capital formation over two-thirds of the world is far too colosal for private capital to accomplish, Capitalism cannot fulfil its primary function of providing capital to mankind. The effort to spread the capitalist integration to all mankind and make it universal is foredoomed to failure. Poverty and war have been the monstrous progenies of capitalism—poverty for two-thirds of mankind and war for the rest—and it is powerless to destroy its own childred.

About the need of early destruction of capitalism and feudalism in two-thirds of the world, there should be no doubt or hesitation. Capitalism must increasingly mean poverty of body and soul to this part of the world. It cannot even feed these populations : it must perpetually undernourish them and occasionally starve them to death. It can only produce for profit, and there is no scope for profit in these underdeveloped economies, not certainly in food and houses and tools that may make the small man produce wealth, but, perhaps, in margarine, medicine, cinemas, and, above all, in speculation.

Communism is a doctrine of social ownership and of release of means of production from their relations of private property. The whole communist doctrine and its general theory on human civilization are proving faulty, for capitalist relations of production are snapping where the forces of production are least developed in areas of high density and low technology. The hope lies shattered that communism could build on the riches of capitalism; it obtains its infrequent opportunity alone in the ruins of capitalism,

the areas of huge populations and small productive forces.

Communism inherits from capitalism its technique of production; it only seeks to smash capitalist relations of production. Communism claims to be the continuator and developer of capitalist technology, when capitalism is no longer able to do so. Communist rationalization of these economies or a hot-house nurturing of productive forces appears to be possible through mass murder unknown to history. But failure is writ large over Communist effort, for no scale of famines nor murders can equip colonial economies with capitalist technology.

In this situation of national and international decay, the doctrine of socialism is becoming the universal profession of the people. The Socialist ideology is, however, beset with traditional forms evolved in Europe and now current throughout the world under the name of socialism.

No greater disaster could befall socialism than if the historical peculiarities of its career in Europe were sought to be universalized and reproduced in the other two-thirds of the world. Socialism in Europe has been gradual, constitutional, and distributive. Socialism henceforth and in the rest of the world must be drastic, unconstitutional when necessary, and lay the accent on production. While European Socialists have earned lasting credit for their faith that to lose democratically is better than to win dictatorially, and thus have set up a model of constitutional action when socialism is in office, socialism in opposition must often adopt the ways of struggle. The processes of persuasion and law-making are not always available or timely; to them must be added the methods of class struggle, particularly in underdeveloped areas. Class struggle hastens and matures the destruction of capitalism, without which two-thirds of the world cannot even make the first move. The class struggle against capitalism is expressed through two major types, that which destroys capitalism in one of its aspects and reinforces it in another, and the other that achieves socialism. Undoubtedly, achievements in the direction of people's properity and the welfare state made by socialism in Europe or socialism within national frontiers are an imperishable symbol for all the world.

Towards the evolution of a universal ideology of socialism, tricks of grammar and debate on the merits of one qualifying adjective rather than another are an obstacle, and so is the waving of a banner on which the name of one teacher rather than another

is inscribed. The conflict between stated principles of ideology and concealed principles of organization is another obstacle to the growth of Socialist thought. But the greatest obstacle is represented by a widespread malady of the human mind, acuter in India than elsewhere, to divide itself into two separate compartments of the abstract and the concrete, the general and the particular, the eternal and the time-bound. Socialism, like every other principle of thought, comes to the mind in the two shapes of the general and the particular. Abstract and generalized socialism is the end of almost every political party in the country, the same as death is the end of every man. On the most generalized principles of thought such as truth and beauty there is and can be little diffrence of opinion among men. Equality, plenty, and democracy are similar generalizations of thought. Differences of opinion arise only when a meaning bound by time and space is put into abstract generalizations. A concrete meaning without its abstract generalization must at some stage lead to death of thought and victory of the *status quo* or reaction. An abstract principle without its concrete particular must also lead to death of thought, through creation of the split mind of two compartments.

Programmes are concretized principles. Principles are generalized programmes. Unaware of this relationship, the political mind of India is wallowing today in the slush of generalized principles without concrete meaning. This error of understanding is causing corruption of thought and action. Political parties that follow different paths or no paths at all are enabled, all of them, to inscribe on their banner the generalized principles of equality, plenty, democracy, and socialism Devoid of concrete meanings, these principles neither mould the mind nor guide action. They only serve to create a condition of general expropriation of phrases and of debates concerning tricks of language and manners of speech. The Indian mind is traditionally happy at the false freedom that comes from the divorce of the abstract and the general from the concrete and the particular, and India is today enjoying the meaninglessly free debate on abstract socialism to which all political parties profess their adherence. The Indian people must cry a halt to this and force their political parties to put concrete meaning into their abstract generalizations.

The Socialist Party must fix the meaning of such words as equality, democracy, and plenty, which have become the ruling concepts of the age, not alone in India but also all the world over.

Equality should thus have a concrete meaning in respect of property aad incomes, both within the nation and among the nations. Such a concrete meaning of equality should fix the ratio between the highest and the lowest incomes, the types of private ownership, and, as a first step, a percentage of war budgets of every nation to go into an international pool for creation of an equal world, in such fashion that the ideal does not more irrelevantly away from the actual and that a conservative and reactionary correspondence between the two does not exist. Through continued thought and combative action, the creative interplay of the abstract and the concrete of principles must take place.

Democracy is thus not at all a manner of speech in regard to some values generalized beyond meaning, but a guide to action on the basis of certain concrete principles that seek to actualize the democratic ideal. The greatest single quality of democracy in the present age is decentralization and its meaning must be fixed both in terms of defined political power belonging to small units of direct democracy and economic arrangements and technology that would give the working man greater understanding of control over productive processes.

In the background of all ruling concepts of the age is the most pervasive of them all, the concept of plenty. Application of science to industry and agriculture has produced such results in one part of the world that men lose their understanding and treat them as though they were marvels or calamities. An ultimited multiplication of produce or a continued reduction of wants are extolled into meaningless abstractions of materialist or spiritual value, but happiness and plenty are as far away as ever. The application of science to industry, which is the foundation for all ruling concepts of the age, must be cleaned of its materialist or spiritual fuzziness and receive a concrete meaning.

The ruling concepts of the age have received a number either of mutually conflicting meanings or of meaninglessly boggy generalizations. The stage is now set to achieve consistency of meaning and harmony of different parts in a single whole. India's socialism has over many years been evolving the total view of comparative multiplication of produce and comparative disciplining of wants within a framework of social ownership and comparative equality of incomes and expenditure. This total view must further deepen. The Socialist Party; while it is a party of fighters, must

also strive to become a party of builders. Through massive thought and action, it must pre-eminently become the builder of the mind.

The Socialist Party decides on the general as well as the particular meaning of certain concepts. All property used as means of production which hires labour shall vest in the State. Private ownership shall be restricted to property which does not employ hired labour and which is worked alone by the owning family. Social ownership shall be held at various levels corresponding to various structures of the state, from village to the federation. The first Socialist government may be permitted to phase the programme of achievement of social ownership, a condition being that the first phase of the programme shall not fall short of socialization of all large scale industry, including banks and other money institutions. Similarly, private ownership over land upon three times the size of a unit which a family of five may cultivate without employing hired labour or mechanization will be permitted, but all lands in excess of this will be distributed among poor peasants and landless labourers. Common lands which have been usurped into private ownership shall return to the village.

The Socialist Party rejects the concepts of compensation for property in the belief that the state has every right to legislate on property, and also because no government can in the foreseeable future award proper compensation for all properties that will have to be socialized in the public interest. The Socialist Party accepts instead the concept of rehabilitation compensation, in terms of alternative employment or small money grants to be awarded to those whom social legislation on property deprives of their levelihood.

Equality of incomes and expenditure should also be directly sought, for even under social ownership of means of production, a class of bureaucrats, managers, and political leaders with high salaries and allowances for comfort and luxury may grow, and exceptionally successful men of the free professions may amass or spend great wealth. All incomes and expenditures shall be brought within such ratio that the top does not exceed ten times the bottom.

In order that schemes of taxation and finance may help the people to a better sense of their duties and to produce more wealth,

as well as to achieve greater solidarity, a Socialist government will undertake progressive removal of taxes which further depress the poor, poison their mutual relationships, and help to build a corrupt or inefficient bureaucracy. As a first step, it will abolish land tax on profitless agriculture or uneconomic holdings. This step will in its turn enable the achievement of a living wage for agricultural labourers, progressive conversions of sharecroppers into farmers and consequent improvement of village relationships, and realization of organic unity of the village, as well as stoppage of uncontrolled and unnecessary spending of public revenues. A similar rationalization of taxes which weigh upon the urban population and hamper their prosperity or breed bribery will take place.

Increasing production of wealth will be sought through as complete utilization of labour as possible in the country. The grafting of the high rates of capitalization that prevail in the European and American world upon a country with a large population and a low equipment cannot produce conditions of abundance or even full employment. Abundance and employment will be sought through a technology and capitalization of the small-unit and power-driven machine where possible, and large-scale industry where necessary.

Administration shall be adjusted to the needs of production and efficient economy instead of those of bureaucracy of power or pelf. Similar to the method of small-scale industry is the need of a state in which power increasingly belongs to the small units of direct democracy. The mode of rule by nominated bureaucracy shall be replaced wherever possible by rule of elected representatives. Units of direct democracy, such as the village, the town, and the district, shall take, share in the sovereignty of the republic and, in any scheme of appropriate division and integration of powers, shall enjoy a constitutional status as honourable as that of central organs. As a first step, the office of the Collector shall be abolished, police shall be placed under district control, and not less than one-fourth of the total revenues and of plan money shall be spent under the initiative and control of district and village assemblies and executives.

Planning shall be undertaken with a view to reconstruct the nation's economy and to invigorate the people and not with a view to appease classes of interests, and ghosts of ideas, or to run with the fashions of the day. Complete accountability, democratic

controls, and publicly known rules of disbursement of all plan and governmental expenditure will remove corruption and inefficiency on the one hand, and stop the breeding of petty tyrants, sycophants, and flatterers on the other. Planning shall wherever possible encourage the small units of production and trade. Prices will be so regulated as to remove disparity between those of agriculture and of industry. In particular, the great robbery which causes steep fall of agricultural prices around the harvest and steep rise later will be stopped.

The Socialist Party believes in the inalienable right of the people to food, cloth, housing, medicine, and education. A Socialist government will begin a phased programme of actualization of these rights. The medical profession shall be progressively socialized and the status of teachers, including primary teachers, lifted up. Publicly known rules rather than arbitrary behaviour shall regulate all types of relationships within the spheres of education and medicine.

Democracy in all circumstances shall be the sheet anchor of the ideas and programmes of socialism. Democracy means the inevitable answerability of administration to elected assembly. It also means recognition and respect of the limited personality of individual, party, government, and State—four categories, which together constitute the agencies of political action. Demolition of their frontiers and of the definite rules of their separation ends democracy. The Socialist Party respects, and will make use of, all elected assemblies from the village to the nation. While out of office, the Socialist Party shall strive to turn representative institutions into a mirror of the sorrows and dreams of the people and shall combat all trends to use them for favours to small and privileged sections. While in government, it shall use them for radical change in the laws and the administration of the land.

The external working of a state is determined by the internal working of its political parties. Democracy dies in the country only after it has died within some of its major organizations. Internal democracy in parties must receive great attention from the people.

Democracy distinguishes itself from fascism in that totalitarian parties announce alone their decision to the people while democratic parties hold also their debates in full hearing of the public. Public issues must be publicly debated while private issues may be

privately debated.

Discipline in democratic parties should never seek to restrict freedom of speech. Political parties have the right to expect a dissenting minority not to act against constitutional decisions, although it may continue to consider them wrong, but the restriction on action should never extend to speech.

Discipline in a democracy does not mean obedience to higher committees or individuals. It means recognition and acceptance of limited authority of committees or individuals, high or low. When a committee or person transgresses the circle of authority drawn for it by the constitution, it has no right to expect others not to act against such decisions.

Discipline comes to a state or party when its constituents subject themselves to publicly known principles of action, do not allow their energies to run waste because of wayward behaviour, and are joined together in progress through the bond of the free mind. Political institutions which enjoin disciplined speech on their followers and permit arbitrary action to their leadership are like an army without knowledge of what it has to do. The limited personality of democratic legislatures and persons makes for an unparalleled fullness of powers arising out of a knowing mind. Aware that discipline should mean the long arm of free speech and the strong fist of controlled action, a political institution may penalize its constituents only in the event of undisciplined and unprincipled action.

Considerations of greed or opportunism sometimes corrupt the relations of a party of opposition with the government party. They are oftener corrupted by the erroneous idea that the nation can be led effectively alone through governmental authority. Such a distorted search for effective leadership always looks out for pretexts and occasions of economic reconstruction or national emergency in either sense of internal insecurity and foreign invasion. In every such situation, however, the nation can be led effectively by a strengthening opposition without participation in the government. The Socialist Party rejects all such search for spurious leadership in same fashion as it spurns considerations of greed.

A government with a clearly held purpose and a clear majority in the legislature can alone enjoy leadership over the nation. Such a government cannot be a coalition government.

The Socialist Party shall, therefore, seek such authority, as comes to an organization from the loyalty of the people, and only when this people's confidence assumes the size of a majority shall the party be willing to accept the reins of office. For all other situations, the Socialist Party shall steel its members into practising the principle of abnegation, so that they may make unselfish use of power when it really comes to them.

In the absence of a clear majority to any party in the legislature, the Socialist Party shall enable democracy to function by tolerating a government of its choice as long as it deems fit in the interest of the workingmen and the nation. It shall not participate in the government that it tolerates. In similar-wise, the Socialist Party shall assist in the combined national effort to repel a foreign invasion without taking part in the government.

The Socialist Party believes that the cry of co-operation between a government party and an opposition party is more rhetorical than real. Such general cries of co-operation lead to cessation of resistance to government acts such as those of oppressive taxation. They have nothing whatever to do with joint pursuits of positive re-construction, and may, at most, create an atmosphere in which a government and a fake opposition jointly pursue the game of deluding the people. Co-operation in such an event is nothing more than the absence of non-co-operation and is therefore another name for suspended animation or paralysis.

The relations of an opposition party with other opposition parties should be governed by the needs of action as well as identity. Wherever action against exploitation and injustice is possible, in however small a degree, under its own leadership, the Socialist Party should always strive to maintain its identity unblurred. Only when action becomes impossible unless in association with other elements may, members of the Socialist Party operate through joint committees of interest organizations such as trade unions, but the party should not form united front committees with other political parties.

Should a political party resolve in principle on dissolution and acceptance of the Socialist Party, although it may still be considering the appropriate occasion to execute the resolution, association with it may be permitted. In general, the Socialist Party should always balance the two claims of action and identity, and while submergence in another political combination should

be irksome to a political party, the rationale of whose existence lies in the unworthinesss of other parties and the worth of its separate programme and principles, maintenance of identity becomes valueless if it results in absence of action.

The crisis of foreign policy is indeed a crisis of human civilization and cannot be overcome unless a people-to-people relationship replaces the government-to-government relationship that obtains in international affairs today and the principle of government non-intervention in other countries' affairs is combined with free intervention of the mind.

The Socialist Party is committed to the principle of equal irrelevance of capitalism and communism in respect of the creation of a new human civilization. It wishes to build a third camp that keeps away from the Atlantic and the Soviet systems and doer not prefer one to the other, holding the two equally good and equally evil, and strives to create a civilization of freemen in an equal world Such a world can be built alone on the basis of the doctrine that all men are equal not only within the nation but also among nations.

Votaries of the theories of co-existence in foreign policy maintain that the capitalist and Communist systems and their respective blocks can co-exist in peace. Actually, both camps press this theory of co-existence into their service mainly to buy a respite when the tensions of cold war become unbearable and the disproportion in armed strength looks dangerous. Two systems, mutually contradictory, hostile, and suspicious, cannot co-exist unless a third new system and integration begins to gather strength and forces the two to co-exist in peace.

Conformism is motivated by the desire to check and cure evil and co-existence by the desire not to impose the truth, as one sees it, on the other. Beyond these two is a third attitude of mind that unites both these desires and is aware that a third new system of growing authority is necessary for two warring camps to live in peace. The moral appeal of the new system, aided by growing economic and armed power, will start a process of approximation between the two warring camps in which they agree to check and remove their own excesses and try to approximate to the new creation and to one another. The creators of a new civilization must be actuated by the impulse of co-existence with approximation in their foreign policy.

Collective security is an uncontestable ideal in pure abstraction. But it can only exist through the concrete manifestation of an international organization with a specific composition and defined executive rights. The United Nations Organization, instead of becoming a repository of the collective conscience of mankind, has degenerated into clearing house of international intrigues. The three defects of lack of universality, the power of veto, and permanent seats on the Security Council need to be removed if its moral authority and general effectiveness is not to suffer. A large section of mankind is out of it, and the international caste system has found juridical expression in the veto and permanent seats. Until such an organization is brought into being and a rational system of collective security created, mankind will be free to form regional alliances of mutual security, although such alliances should never include inter-continental partners.

Growth of national armaments is a consequence of the absence of an effective collective security. No distinction need be made between nuclear and conventional weapons, as the latter in sufficient numbers may be as deadly as the former. To most of mankind, disarmanent must mean limitation on all types of weapons, although a diplomatic beginning may be made with ban on nuclear weapons.

True and effective disarmament can be achieved only when the world becomes equal. The gross disparity in productive powers of the developed one-third and the underdeveloped two-thirds of mankind produces a serious economic unbalance, giving rise to various forms of conflicts and to the mad race for armaments to conserve the treasures of the privileged parts. Comparative equality of production and capital equipment for the purpose must be made available to man in all his domains through existing western technology, which does not appear possible, and therefore, a new appropriate technology. Foreign aid in its present form is not only humiliating and dangerous to the receiving countries but can never be adequate to meet their needs and requirements. Such aid definitely corrupts the backward countries and invariably maintains in power the forces of *status quo*. Aid to underdeveloped countries must come through a World Development Authority to which every nation contributes according to its ability and from which every nation receives according to its needs. Until such an authority comes into being, international

socialism may attempt to set up model projects through capital collected from all such organizations and men as would listen to its appeal. Furthermore, ownership rights over foreign capital, which has already paid out the principal many times over in interest or dividend, should rest in the land where it is invested.

All forms of colonialism are a shame to mankind and a serious impediment to the growth of an equal world. Political rule of an occupation army and of one nation over another must go, whatever might be the political character of the agents of people's rebellion. All Africa must particularly be free and united in such portions as wish to do so. Socialist internationalism must stand behind all struggles against colonialism and render all possible assistance to freedom fighters.

The non-interventionist doctrine is rendering the human mind impervious to all violations of human rights outside one's own frontiers except when they take place within the frontiers of the enemy. This compartmental vision must end. The doctrine of non-intervention must be restricted to government, and man should learn to intervene in all affairs of his kind. Man's right to travel, work and die anywhere in the world should be recognized, and citizenship should as much be a matter of intention and cultural loyalty as of birth or residence.

International tensions and conflicts of the day relate largely to disputed sovereignty over one territory or another or modes of unification of unnaturally partitioned countries. The mixing up of these disputes with the global conflict of power camps has stood in the way of their resolution. A programme of recognition of existing frontiers in order to ease tensions, of pacific unification of artificially partitioned peoples in order to resolve conflicts and of guaranteed neutralization, with limitation on armaments, of defeated nations, and other possible springboards of attack is the only realistic basis on which such international problems can be tackled.

In order that India's socialism may effectively enlighten the country's public opinion on requirements of foreign policy, it must keep in the forefront of its international aims India's dissociation from the British Commonwealth. It must continue unceasing efforts to build up a third system, which adheres to the principle of equal irrelevance between the two camps and refuses to put itself in alternate service of either.

The Socialist doctrine needs to be retold in terms of the simple truth that all men are equal, not only within the nation but also among nations. When that happens, it will change its traditional forms on practically every major score; in place of an increasing standard of living within national frontiers, decent and minimum living standards for all men in the world; in place of the alternatives between parliamentary and insurrectionary action, a balanced mixture such as constitutional action where possible and civil resistance when necessary; in place of halting and gradualistic reforms of property and income, socialization of all property except such as does not employ hired labour and the fixing of a top-bottom ratio, for instance of ten to one, in incomes; in place of an international organization of unequal members, a comity of nations equal in membership and executive rights and the introduction of adult franchise, however hedged, into international councils. Socialism must first achieve the union of mankind in the mind before it can translate that into practice.

The concrete aim of the Socialist movement in India should be to bring on the stage of history those whom it has so far outcast. Hundreds of millions of workingmen and lower castes are today the objects of history and not its creators except for those fleeting moments when something big touches their heart. The Socialist Party can touch their heart if it professes and practices the faith of identification of one Indian with another. It is today, like every other party, composed largely of lower middle class elements. When leaders arise out of working men and lower castes, every one in the population will acquire a personality and the nation will grow in prosperity and power. The Socialist Party must restlessly strive to build such leaders so that the process of identification of one Indian with another is brought where the breast is wide and knows no narrow meanness.

With such growing identification of the people and their leadership, the socialist movement will progressively learn the joint art of exciting and consolidating. To provoke a people to action beyond control, as communism sometimes does, may lead to short or long letharge and oft times disbelief. To provoke insufficiently or less than the situation requires, as anaemic oppositions do, is to stagnate and often to step into reaction. Exciting the masses without consolidating them through earnest intellectual work and emotional identification, as the socialist movement has so far done,

leads to large surface activity and little substantial change. The socialist movement must now learn to provoke as well as to consolidate, exciting only as much as it can fulfil, to provoke and excite as much as the situation currently requires and, after having consolidated the gains to provoke and excite again and more, until the last battle against exploitation or the last provocation is won. Every demonstration or march or struggle must be continually preceded and followed by enrolment of members, formation of committees, operation of study and work centres, and joint agitations of opinion.

Alongside of giving a firm foundation to the theory of socialism, it is equally necessary to discover appropriate forms of action through which the doctrine may be realized. All action should be aimed at the expression and organization of the people's will and at reconstructing national life. The party of socialism should continually strive to become the spokesman of the people and organizer of its will, resister against injustice and accomplisher of reconstruction. It must be ready ever to take part in constructive action to enlighten the popular verdict and be enlightened by it in turn, and to resist injustice; three modes of action already symbolized by the spade, the vote and the prison. It must indicate by its accomplishment, however slender, in the present and while out of office, what it promises when it is put into the government.

Lowly constructive action is the lifeblood of all genuinely revolutionary activity. Revolution can never restrict itself to parliamentary action. While the vote is the supreme expression of the people's will, it is recorded once in several years. Insensitive submission ensues if the vote is not supplemented by recurrent awakening through the invited suffering of evil resistance. Civil resistance and class struggle are but two names for a single exercise in power, reduction of the power of civil and increase in the power of the good. An act of civil resistance or class struggle must however, pass the test of immediacy and must not make use of lies and violence and seek to justify present murder by an imagined outcome of future health.

Traditional Socialists believe that the ultimate overthrow of the existing order cannot be carried out except by force. The debate of violence in a revolution has hitherto been corrupted by concentration on the single question whether the method of armed

rebellion should ever or never be used. The use or non-use of violence in the last stages of a revolution, particularly since the traditional alternatives between parliamentary and insurrectionary action have been supplemented by the third choice of civil resistance, is a matter of secondary detail. The real question is whether to organize revolution on the basis of non-violence or that of violence.

While a revolution may regrettably erupt into violence in its last stages, particularly when a decaying government seeks to dispense with democratic forms, participants in a revolution must definitely resolves to organize on the continuing base of peaceful methods. Doctrines which peach the need of violence are incapable of achieving a classless or casteless society. Socialism should strive to achieve such a basis of peaceful struggles as will lead to increased individual initiative and responsibility, and not to concentration of power. Organization of violence inevitably leads to concentration of power.

The distinction between civil and uncivil disturbances, on the one hand, and constitutional agitations and civil disobedience, on the other, should never be lost sight of. Constitutional agitation, however fierce, does not acquire the character of civil resistance as long as it does not step out to transgress the law. Civil resistance is committed to methods of peace, and as such the answer to it should never go beyond arrest and imprisonment. Similarly, a constitutional agitation does not acquire the character of civil resistance unless it deliberately acts against the law.

Civil resistance is of two types, individual and collective. While Socialists in ever-increasing numbers should cultivate the habit of individual civil resistance against all expression of tyranny, the Socialist Party may organize collective civil resistance or strikes against governmental and non-governmental injustices on all levels, local, state, zonal, or national. A collective resistance involves the fate of many persons, it must be resorted to only after collective decisions and sanctions have been taken at appropriate levels.

The individual civil resister knows the verdict of history that tyrants live only where there are cowards, that the peoples of the world have alternated between a 99 years' existence as tame cows and a year's existence as tigers, that, after long and placid submission to authority, they have suddenly erupted to overthrow one tyranny and build up another. While attempts may be made to

change the tyrant's heart, the real point is to change the people's heart into ordinary human behaviour from long-term quiescence alternating with short-term ferocity. In terms not alone of present obligations but also of the future of human civilization, the worth of a political party will be judged by the extent to which it assists in the growth of such civilly resisting individuals.

All parties and persons desirous of maintaining methods of non-violence must learn to be equally loyal to revolution, for there has been a tendency to subordinate revolution to non-violence. Where such a subordination of revolution to non-violence takes place, conservative maintenance of the existing order is an inevitable result, the same as chaos in the begining and tyranny afterwards are inevitable results if non-violence is subordinated to revolution.

As the Socialist Party pursues its battle for identification and against exploitation in the context of India, it will for the first time be able to evolve a doctrine of socialist thought and action which will seek to achieve equality in the material realm as also in that of the mind. India at her best sought to achieve equality of mind, and she neglected the claims of social and economic equality; Europe at her best is seeking to achieve social and economic equality but has neglected the claims of equality of mind. Mankind may expectantly await the results of an identification on the twin levels of the mind and the body against the backdrop of a cultural canvas of poise.

While India's history of the mind shall ever beckon to the Indian to look inward and not to hurry and to remember that all uninspected action carries within it elements of bondage, the socialist war on exploitation and for identification will inevitably unfold continuous activity. India's socialism shall never forget that activity degenerates into strife and poise into sloth and there is need therefore to create a culture of tranquil activity. The rest of the world may also richly contribute to this endeavour.

The world is today rent asunder. It is divided between regions of great wealth and marshes of great poverty. Within the region of great wealth, it suffers the small division between capitalism and communism. The individual man is also divided within himself so that his personality receives maximum expression in one direction and is atrophied in another, and he is not even aware of the need of freedom for full expression. To these divisions of nation against

nation, of class against class, and of the individual within himself; national, class, and personality divisions and struggles, the socialist activity for identification may bring a solution and a unifier and set mankind on the path to a socialist civilization where equality is also fullness in matters material and of the mind.

A remarkable conjunction of economic development and the spirituality of freedom and peace seems to be the mark of our times. It may be doubted whether man ever before stood face to face with his destiny in this way. Man's new civilization would attempt to achieve approximation of the human race and the overcoming of class and caste and regional shifts through comparatively equal production in all the world. Its technology and administration would be suited to this requirement, and on the basis of respective sovereignties of decentralized communes and an integrated mankind, the people would be able to rule themselves.

Means of production would be brought under social ownership, although such forms of property as justly redivided land may be left to individual use. Loyal adherence to the concept of a minimum and a maximum of incomes within the nation, so as to tend towards equality, would enlarge and deepen the process of approximation. Man, individually and in the collective, will know the practice of civil disobedience against injustice. The government of the people by the people for the people will be achieved through the government of the commune by the commune for the commune, on the one hand, and the government of mankind by mankind for mankind, on the other.

11

INDIA'S PATH TO SOCIALISM

RAMMANOHAR LOHIA

The subject of today's lecture series is "India's Path to Socialism". It is made up of three terms : (i) India, (ii) Socialism, and (iii) Path. A full understanding of these three terms is necessary. If we know their meanings and afterwards establish a correlation among them, a real meaning will follow. Before I do this I want to clear a misunderstanding. May be some of the speakers here as also many of the audience consider socialism to be only one with different paths. I think it will be a blunder, a blunder also according to logic because it is wise to recognise a relation of mutual give and take between the path and the goal. As goal determines to some extent the path so also path determines the outlines of the goal, at least its features. When we accept one socialism throughout the world, it is only a matter of acceptance. We accept in our mind something out of a pre-notion, then the pleasure which one can get from following a variety of paths is denied to us. Therefore, I would like that we should have a flexible approach with regard to the goal, as we have about the path, while both goal and path are finally related to socialism. Now, first of all, I shall put forth roughly a definition of socialism as it occurs to me.

SOCIALISM—A DEFINITION

Our country has a bad tradition of parroting. It was so before

and it is so now. It is I think a one thousand or two thousand year old malaise. We take a word and start repeating it, snuffing out its meaning but content with our repetition. But I don't want to use a word devoid of sense. I think the shortest but fully meaningful definition of socialism will be 'the best way to achieve equality and prosperity'. On the one hand people should be equal and on the other hand they should grow more and more prosperous. Prosperous in both the senses : firstly, in food, living and material affairs; and secondly, at peace in their mind.

The idea of achieving both equality and prosperity is socialism. In our country this definition acquires a deeper meaning, for I think that here or in any other country where there is poverty, absolute poverty, the only means to achieve prosperity is equality. There equality ceases to be only a goal, an ideal to be equal, to be mutually happy, to be friendly, friendship finally means equality, If there is fraternity, there will be equality and naturally equality will mean fraternity, and when we are mutually on friendly terms we shall be prosperous. Equality by itself is a very good thing, but considering the present poverty of India I want to emphasize to you all our prosperity can also be achieved through equality, because the more we minimise our luxuries, extravagance from our annual income and utilise them on improving agriculture and industry the more prosperous we shall become. Equality may be only an ideal or a goal, or a desire of the heart for the developed countries of Europe and America; but for us it is an economical necessity because by opening this avenue and following this path we can make our country prosperous. Therefore, when I have talked of achieving these two ideals of equality and prosperity, I would also like to say especially of our country that equality is a means to achieve prosperity. At times I condescend to say that if our country can be made prosperous by adopting a capitalistic path and if someone is prepared to promise prosperity by following the capitalistic path, then I shall accept that challenge because we are so poor, we are in so intriguing a situation that we don't have even food, and if any means can be found to fulfil our daily needs then I am ready to adopt it. Today, if I reject capitalism it is mainly because it cannot fulfil its own engagements, duties, or to put it in another way, it cannot fulfil its traditional role. Capitalism means accumulation of wealth, to increase investment in agriculture and industry so that wealth and production may increase. Today

capitalism cannot exploit extremely poor countries like India even for its own sake, because we do not have abundance from which it (capitalism) might earn. A capitalist country spends a big part of its annual national production on comforts, luxury and extravagance whereas in our poor country extravagance should completely by done away with for sometime so that from our products whatever is saved after feeding the people and giving some ordinary comforts to a few big people should be used for improving agriculture and industry.

INDIA—WEAKNESS AND STRENGTH

Now let us study more closely socialism and understand what our country is. It would be too vast a subject to discuss what India has been in course of history. I shall put forth some salient features of India during last 1500 years. These features are related with our socialism.

India has both shame and pride, both these are intermingled with each other. It is a matter of shame that during the last fifteen centuries she has neither truly been independent, nor she was able to save in an organised way her territory ever since the fall of Harsha's Kingdom of Kannauj. India since then till today has been like vegetable plants—this simile may conveniently be used while the countries of Europe may be compared to animals. This also is apparent that animals live fast, their life is comparatively fast. Plants, trees, vegetables are comparatively slow. Sometimes they may appear to be pleasing but from a people's point of view I will prefer the speed of animals to the comparative calm and grace of plants and vegetables, although I would like ourselves to be neither trees or animals. I don't know if during the last fifteen hundred years there has ever been a revolution against internal tyranny, there may be some dispute whether or not there was any such revolution earlier. Of late I read thoroughly the history of Delhi and yet I wish I could find one single instance when the people of Delhi might have rise against its internal oppressors. However, I found just one interesting instance. Aurangzeb had arranged a victory-march to be led by the man who had imprisoned Dara Shikoh. A man spit at this man who, sitting on horse-back led the procession Except this in entire Delhi, thers was no other instance of any uprise against internal oppressors. Where there is

so much of inaction and unrevolution, where immobility is so great and no changes take place, some other peculiarities follow. Instead of saying why it so happens I shall simply draw your attention to two things. It is a strange country in its approach to women. In the domestic sphere, she is idolised while outside it she has no status. Indian thinking has become dirty and impure with regard to woman's character. I don't have the slightest hesitation in saying that the efforts made by this country to seek woman's chastity, purity, stand unsurpassed in the world. Consequently, the dirt found here cannot be found elsewhere. Unless men drive out of their thinking the fuss regarding women's purity and as long as we want to keep our woman chaste, we cannot make this country a dynamic one. Because the greatest obstacle on the path of revolution is, perhaps, that the thinking of men and even that of women has become so much obsessed about purity that half of the population just fails to associate itself with matters of revolution and society. It is preoccupied only with insignificant matters and it has neither time nor desire to take part in public matters. In a country where women are so handicapped, as they are in India, revolution becomes difficult. Those who want to liberate revolution in India, must first of all struggle against and put an end to the idea of women's purity. I don't say that the women should be filthy; I don't mean this in the least. I want to say only this that we aim at purity but reality and insistence falls on filth. Secondly, I draw your attention to the rich and the poor. That is casts. Some people maintain that there is caste everywhere in the world. It is entirely correct that there is class-division in other countries, sometimes this division grows so strong that it takes the form of castes. But except in India caste as a social system prevails nowhere in the world. Now poor South Africa is trying to establish separate colonies for the whites and the blacks. We in India in each one of the entire 4 lakhs of villages have established separate colonies—Bamnauti, Chamrauti, Jhamrauta, Pasi Bari, Nai Mohalla. One for each caste and there will be a long list of them. The class-division is so deep-rooted that they have been sanctioned by cannons of vanity and by *mantras*. The division that South Africa wants to achieve by guns is achieved here through *mantras*. Revolution is handicapped by our attitude with regard to women, revolution is handicapped also by caste, and eventually it has become a country of un-revolution.

I spoke of life speed. This indictment has come true literally in case of the Uttar Pradesh Government employee's strike which has just ended. In another country this thing should have been impossible because of the Government's attitude and because of people's attitude; both should have been eager and impatient, and a solution should have evolved. But here both are impotent. Strikes go on, the Government has no care to save its prestige and honour. I know that even in foreign countries there have been strikes by Government employees, but, as far as I know, these have not lasted for more than a day or a day and a half because there it would certainly mean either killing 10, 15, 20 thousand or a lakh or two lakh people and the end of the strike with the help of the military; or the strike would succeed so much as to overthrow the Government. But here the speed is slow. It is on one hand, a matter of national shame, while on the other hand, it shows a way out. Who knows by dragging on and in this slow fashion this country of un-revolution might mature into a state of revolution. Today only the government employees are launching strikes, a time may come when the army may refuse to fire, then the government will fall. May be the police will also finally turn disobedient, that would mean complete revolution. This is how we can hope that even a people moving at a slow pace can ultimately achieve revolution. Now, I shall talk of a good point about our country, which has special relevance to socialism. After all in the realm of speech and idea, we are a country of detachment. It is true that in actual behaviour, attachment shown to body and wealth in this country is unparalleled in the world. Greed for money is excessive and though the body might be rotting, the prospect of death causes cry and tears. But still, in books, speech, songs, ideas and conventions detachment is the ruling passion.

The idea of detachment probably took its rise from the famous *sloka* in Ishopanishad, which says : "All that you see in this world is not yours. Don't enjoy greedily thinking this to be yours." If this idea had sufficient potency then people would have adopted their daily life in accordance with it; and it would have come very close to socialism, their society would have become socialistic. But it had no strength from that point of view. Maximum detachment to life and property went side by side with maximum detachment in the realm of the mind. This is the great tragedy of the Indian tradition; or is it a trick of life itself ? While ancient

India tried to do away with attachment to property Karl Marx tried to put an end to the institution of property. The institution of property converts social wealth into the wealth of some few persons; it becomes personal property. Indian culture tried to put an end to love for wealth. Marx wanted to put an end to private property. Indian culture has been a failure in its objective, so would be Marxism if it were to operate on its single track. Its failure will be more and more evident in coming years. Already from the examples available from Russia, it appears that unless there is a simultaneous bid to eradicate love for wealth, the abolition of private property as an institution alone might not succeed fully in its objective. The ideal can be achieved only when abolition of property as an institution is joined to eradication of property as attachment. I believe such a reconciliation is possible and both, the substance as well as the sentiment of property, can be done away with. The society that will ultimately emerge will be what Marx set forth as his goal. Not only Marx, many other prophets of mankind have laid their lives dreaming of it. India has a special genius, by virtue of her Upanishadic tradition, to attempt such a synthesis.

THE ASPECT OF DISTRIBUTION

Now let us try to understand still more closely the meaning of prosperity with equality or socialism. Socialism has two aspects. It can be considered from two view-points : firstly, from the aspect of production; secondly, from the aspect of distribution. Nationalisation of banks, end of monopoly, nationalisation of other types of industry, foreign and internal trade, that is, who should have the ownership and control over the production, is one aspect. The other aspect is that of distribution—how and among what classes should the annual wealth of the nation be distributed.

I think, in a country like India the aspect of distribution should be stronger. Hitherto, even after we attained freedom, greater emphasis has been put on production. Whatever slogans have been raised are related to the as pect of production. Had we simultaneousuly discussed problem of distribution, we might have made great advancement by now. In extremely poor conntries the expenditure or income of every person and family should have

defined limit so that nation's money is not wanted in extravagance but is utilized for the modernisation of production. It may be pointed out that this idea was included in Karachi resolution. Then Rs. 500 per month was the proposed limit. How unreal that limit proved : It could not be implemented. Human greed alone does not account for this failure. There was a mistake of logic. The Karachi proposal failed not only because there was a big departure from reality but also because the proposal itself was fallacious. That proposal was passed in 1921, that is, about 35 years ago. It was said that the limit on ministers' and government employees' income should be Rs 500 per month. But no ceiling was put on the income of lawyers, doctors, millionaires and traders. How could it be possible ? If there is greed and extravagance all around then the ministers and governmetal employees living in that environment are bound to be swayed by the prevalent situation. It was a mistake of conceptions. If a ceilling has to be put, it must be put on everyone's income and expenditure. I emphatically say that in today's India a ceiling must be put on every person and family's income and expenditure. I have been repeatedly speaking of income, but I am not talking of income alone, because the big people of today's India have learnt cunning ways, particularly the bureaucrats and ministers—their salary is small but they get several types of allowances beside salary. For example, housing allowance, car allowance, gardener's allowance and many more uncommon allowances. If they are all added up, I would like to stress, then on a bureaucrat or a minister, whose monthly salary is Rs. 2,000, the state has to spend 20 to 30 thousand rupees a day. We fail to notice this situation only because we have not cleared our mind about distribution. It is not because of lack of honesty or character alone, but also because of wrong thinking. It is said that people have become dishonest in this country. I accept that honesty and character are lacking, but a bigger cause is wrong-thinking. Today, the country's thinking is wrong, There were several courses open to us 20 years ago after Independence. In particular, there were two paths open, our committed thinking committed a mistake—it took up one path and left the rest. Matter worsened because of that. The decision taken by big people and government was to modernise the country but they did not pay any attention to modernisation of production, nor did they consider the fact that as long as the production was not

modernized, extravagance of spending had to be checked. They tried to modernise production and consumption simultanenusly.

I don't apprecrate everything of Russia, certain things have been monstrous. But I want to speak in clear terms that in the beginning years when questions were raised regarding production in revolutionary Russia, the, she followed more of Gandhian principles of simplicity to increase her wealth. Then people used to say that shaving razor cost too much and that it scratched the chin, that cloth was coarse, it was not soft, some of the consumer goods were horrible. The authorities paid no heed to it. Russia concentrated her energy, capability, power and labour on the modernization of production and much later the time came for the modernization of expenditure. I think that if after independence we had concentrated our efforts for, say, 20 to 25 years only on modernization of production, then perhaps now the time would have been there to modernize our consumption. But there was that initial mistake. People thought that there was no harm if some big people lived in luxury and comfort. Some of them went to the extent of formulating a principle out of it : since our country is big, and has a glorious pact, unless some people lived pompously the foreigners coming to India might consider us poor. And for that pomp and vanity the big people here wasted the wealth of the country. The pomp and prestige belonged to the big people, the Prime Minister, the bureaucrats and the millionaires, but did it ever belong to a primary-school teacher or a peasant of the village ? No attention was paid to the latter's prestige as was done in case of the big people. Some people said what harm was there if some big people lived a luxurious life, and imitated America and Russia. What was there to be angry about ? After all they could not spend much. But in reality, the matter does not end there. If the Prime Minister alone were to spend lavishly I would have kept quiet, but I know that every man tries to imitate his superior to the extent he can. I accept that the Chief Minister of a State cannot imitate the Prime Minister, but he imitates as much as he can. Then the minister imitates the chief as much as he can and then comes the turn of the bureaucrat and the Tehsildar followed by Patwari, but let us leave the Patwari for he comes in the ordinary category. Thus, 50 to 60 lakh big people have set themselves to the task of imitating the extravagance of Europe and America. I

made a calculation and according to my calculation about 15-20 hundred million rupees are spent annually on this imitation of extravagance. This amount can easily be saved. I can go to the extent of proposing that it is not necessary to take away all this money through nationalization or excessive taxation, but let us evolve some such method by which the profit may not go to people but instead may be accounted to their credit. But for next 10-20 years they should not get the profit, it will only remain credited against their names, and if after 20-30 years India decides to develop on capitalist lines and wants to pay back the amount, I don't mind that. The need of the hour demands that nobody should get money from the country's annual income for modernization of expenditure.

Distribution, therefore, occupies a supreme role, it should be controlled, a check should be put on it, ceiling should be fixed, money should be saved and invested on the improvement of production. Money should be invested on improving canals, wells and ponds for irrigation rather than on imitating Europe and America. After all, Russia and America have not achieved their present status in one day. They took hundreds of years, if not hundreds, at least 10, 20 or 30 years for it. Still, if an educated Indian thinks that he can reach the present American level of expenditure without achieving her intermediate programmes of production during last 200-250 years, then I don't thing there would be a greater idoit. The last 25 years of India have not only been years of dishonesty but also those of idiocy.

The contradictions that exist in our country today have never been there elsewhere in the world. I always wonder how such a society and its economic structure can exist. It is sheer magic. On one side are the 60 per cent of our people who live on a daily income of 3-4 annas; on the other side there are people who spend or earn thousand rupees daily. Anyway, that is only a general frame; behind it is stratification unparalleled in the world. The gap of inequality is nowhere so big and the layers are nowhere so numerous. Generally, it so happens that the poorer a country, the greater is its inequality. But when we look into the actuality, the details present a hopeless situation. There are industrial labourers whose daily wages are 7 to 8 rupees, there are some types who get even 10 to 15 rupees. These may be labourers working in an oil-refinery, or steel industry or on sea ports. There are other

labourers who get only two or two and a half rupees a day. Laourers engaged in small-scale works get 1 or 1½ rupees a day, but labourers in a modern factory get 2-3 rupees, as in cloth mills, whereas labourers in other modern industries get 7-8 rupees, despite the fact that they are not more qualified. In fact, the economic order has become illogical, static and nothing good can come out of it. All kinds of irrational things have been done. The foreigners who ruled India did whatever they liked and whichever way it suited their own interests. Then our government went on adding mistakes. In order to liberate the economy from all this rot my suggestion is a sure device : to limit everyone's income and expenditure to Rs. 1500 per month. Communists, socialists and leftists of all varieties have been clamouring for nationalisation. They ask for nationalisation of banks as a corrective to the economy. Will these small nationalisations yield any result ? What gains did France and Italy reap from the nationalisation of banks ? Did it give their economies a socialistic turn ? These small nationalisations will not do. In order to get some results from nationalisation we shall have to nationalise not only banks, but a lot others, the cloth mills, sugar mills, and who knows what other things have to be nationalised.

The absurdity of the economic set-up shows itself more clearly in case of house and land rents. In Indian towns and cities and especially in cities, people have to pay one rupee per square foot as monthly rent for dirty, striking places, rooms with no proper ventiliation. As against this the monthly rent of a rupee is to be paid in East European countries for one square yard, and those rooms are more decent. Since the average income of an European if 4 to 6 times that of an average Indian income; so economical that in India the rental is 40 to 50 times more than that of East European countries. Behind it is the long story of the imperialist rulers who took over nearly one-third land of big cities only for government bungalows. The second cause were the capitalists who leased land for profiteering. There are instances where a piece of lands which cost Rs. 6,000 thirty years ago, costs 6 lakhs of rupees today. Even gambling does not pay so rich dividends. We have to find some solution to end all this and I think that legislation cannot solve this problem. Finally some day or other a crowd of 50,000 or a lakh men will have to take over these lands and lands occupied by big people in the heart of cities for golf and

horse races These things may be permissible only if they are played away from the city. May be, and if need be it will have to be done, a law has to be enacted that one person or family cannot have more than one house. Law will also have to made regarding the area of such houses Maximum concession that should be granted will be to permit people to have one house for residence and another for letting out. But such laws can be enacted effectively only when there is a revolution of situation, for although the parliament and the legislative assemblies have the power to enact, they cannot do so without an upsurge outside.

The serious disparities that exist in our economy became evident when a Lok Sabha debate made it clear that the lower 60 per cent of the population live on an income of bare 3 annas a day, whereas those who spend more than a thousand per month are 50 lakhs in number. There are some people who spend as much as 5, 10, 15 or 50 thousand rupees a month. In such a situation when the Congress Government or her supporters talk of an average, it makes no sense unless one finds out varying averages, for example, an average for the upper 10 to 15 per cent, a lower average for the next 10 to 20 per cent, and a still lower average for the bottom 60 per cent. If these differences are brought to the knowledge of the Indian people then they will have a vivid picture of their own situation. We are told all the time that during the last 20 years ctoth production has increased from 12 to 17 years, 10 lakh bicycles are produced in place of 4 lakh, sugar production has grown from this quantity to that quantity. All this gives us a picture of pseudo-development. It is only when we consider the income of the lower and major part of the population, we realise that hardly 10 or 20 per cent benefit by this marginal growth of production. By the growth of car-production only one per cent of the population is benefited. The increase in cloth production has benefited perhaps 20 per cent; I can confidently say that there are 40 per cent people who are not benefited all by this increase.

PATH : REVOLUATION

The crucial question is at what point this economic order should be changed. If we understand what India means, what socialism means, it will be easy to choose a path. There is no

doubt that whenever there was a revolution against an internal oppressor it was always accompanied with bloodshed. There has been bloodshed in our country also, but all these struggles have been against foreigners. I was told that once Dr. Ansari's mother made a significant remark—when British rule ended and communal riots were taking place. She said that whenever the rulers of Delhi changed during last 1500 years, there was blood-shedding. So the rulers changed. But this referred to the foreigners. At present I am talking of a local revoluation against internal oppressors. That has not taken place during the last 1500 years. But wherever in the world it took place, the ill-doers were differentiated from their crities. In France 10-15 thousand persons were properly prosecuted in law courts and persecuted by guillotine as they call it. Even in Russia thousands of people died. The ill-doers, the old landlords, capitalists or big bureaucrats were executed I can understand this thing. During last 20 years I have seen some minor happenings in our country and though I don't like them, I understand how, when the people of France or Russia had decided to revolt, it was felt that the ill-doers had to be wiped out along with the ills. I don't like it; I want a revolution in which the higher up people's heart may change at some stage and the lower people may awaken to rise high. And if these two classes happen to co-operate it will be a unique path for the world, and in the socialism born therefrom we shall we able to finish ownership not only as a personal asset but also greed for ownership. I have a strong faith that unless we finish both private wealth and love for wealth, such a society cannot succeed. India's efforts for 4000 years have gone waste. Marxism is recent, so its efforts appear successful but after 1000 or 500 years Marxism will also be lost half-way. This matter of private property can only end when man will conquer both these weaknesses: love for property and private ownership. It does not mean that wealth should not exist. Finally a balance will be struck, but I believe that the more property will be collectivised better will be people's welfare. Even then problems will remain to be solved. After all some end will be there. I am foreseeing both aspects of future. Many people have calculated where Russia will be by 1999, and what position America will have then, calcuations have been made and facts quoted for their substantiation, that America will earn annually 40,000 rupees per head by 1999. I am taking the present value of rupee in consideration. But, the way

Indian rupee is losing value, the above amount will have to be raised. But by present value of various currencies, America will earn annually 40,000 rupees per person. Similarly Russia will earn 20,000 rupees annually per person. It is useless to talk of India in this context. If this government continues, then people from all over the world may bring their children here to show them what poverty is and how their uncivilized forefathers once lived. Against Amrica's 40,000 or Russia's 20,000 there will be India with 1,000 or 2,000. This fate can be avoided only if people awaken, overthrow this government and set up a new order. Then we also might increase our annual income. Imagine those socities where there is 40,000 or 20,000 rupees per head. It means a car for every family. This is even now true of America, it will soon be true for Russia. Then imagine how the thinking will change. The little tension which is there now between America and Russia will almost vanish and the living in both these countries will be almost similar. The people in both countries will have cars, similar desires, similar ambitions, similar difficulties—all these will be alike. Simultaneously I would like to tell you a story. Once I was going out in a car. I saw a girl of 20 years, may be sce was 30 years for these days a woman of 30 appears to 20. She was driving alone. We had to go a little faster. How carelessly she was driving the car : One of her hands was on the car's door and with the other hand she was driving the car slowly. She had mental strength, physical strength and probably showing her control on the car, she was boosting up her spirits. Whatever the civilization—be it horse civilization or elephant civization—a family which had a horse or an elephant or has a car, will give a certain pride to its children. I want everyone to have that pride. In America and Russia it will be so by 1999. I wish I could give a car each to those boys and girls who are sitting here before me and they too could drive a car as leisurely as that girl did. I want a society where I shall see everyone in glory and pride. Prosperity has its bright aspects. But it has its dark aspect too, and man becomes so engrossed in earining the necessitess of life that the other aspects of living are undermind. In that case everything will be useless. There two spheres, the two strains of living will have to be balanced. Greed will have to be overcome. Happiness should not associated with comforts of living. Even today if we look out properly we shall find that really great men of the country,

thinkers, scientists and artists do not necessarily have big houses like those of the capitalists, bureaucrats or political leaders, but have happiness and pleasure in their life. Shall we ever be able to achieve that condition in which despite plenty, man will limit his requirements of life. One way for it is to limit personal ownership as much as possible and increase public ownership, but even after that the question of greed will remain and we shall have to find a mental solution.

It is apparent the things I have said are not easy when put in the context of today's world. Take, for example, America. America has been revolutionary, and I do agree, the people there still have a revolutionary temperament compared to ours. After all some thinkers of America have suggested to chalk out a programme to provide every man and woman with a minimum income, whether employed or not. This is a dream cherished by all great socialists. Any way this is an ideal and don't have to discuss it here. In fact the revolutionary feeling of America is lying in fetters in some dark cage, from where it has to be liberated. As far as I have understood, it is that the people of America and particularly the influential ones, feel that only industrial revolution can make the world prosperous. There they stop. The same mistake was committed by the Indian government which thought that by technical revolution or industrialisation we shall be able to solve all problems. The American are spreading this ideology throughout the world. But it is impossible to achieve a technical and industrial revolution without a complimentary revolution in thinking habits and the socio-economic structure. So the Americans are commiting a mistake here. Russia also wants revolution. But gradually it has reached or is about to reach a stage where it would not like much trouble like the Americans. So it is following the American path; they are brothers for they both do not like troubles In place of a revolution, Russia wants in the countries over which it can use its influence, a set of rulers who would give prominence to the public sector in industry and commerce thus minimizing the importance of the private sector. The conflict between public and private sectors in India was to some extent caused by Russian guidance. Both American and Russian processes are futile because they want revolutionary changes to flow downward to the people from something established above them. Such imposed, which I call downward revolution,

never succeeds. Revolution should always be upgoing and initiated by the people. Mere legislation, programme, and industry would not to do unless people rise and think in a new direction. A good number of laws have been passed, about Harijans and untouchability and minimum wage. I think crores of people can be benefited even if the present law about agricultural wages is enforced. But who will enforce it ? It concerns crores of agricultural labourers. How can they profit by it unless they themselves know it ? Leave aside labourers, even tenants do not know the laws about land ownership. Laws are passed but still they don't know about them. Unless people rise through their own organistion and proper understanding, these downward revolutions would not benefit them. Ordered revolutions, at which Russia aims, cannot succeed.

You may point out that Chinese revolution is upgoing, it starts from the masses. I don't agree. Somehow, may be due to frustration and bitterness, Chinese revolution has turned monstrous. Too much of it comes from above, from force and organization and too little from the people. Thinking is almost lost there. The vioce of the heart is not heard. Therefore, it cannot have the desired effect. A successful revolution has to be based on people's own efforts. The ideas must spring from the heart of the people and not dictated from above or beyond. A managed revolution that does not react to the oppression East Bengal but repeats slogans about brutal excesses in Rhodesia and Vietnam, will always be abortive. Revolution should take its rise from the innermost depths of the heart of a people. Thus, all the three types, technical and industrial revolution, as inspired by America, ordered revolution through public sector as conceived by Russia and revolution sheer violence as advocated and managed by China are doomed to failure in respect of socialist objectives.

We hear a lot about political and economic imperialisms. But the worst type of imperialism is that of production Not much is heard about the great inequalities of production. A thing produced by an Indian worker in an hour, is produced in three minutes by the American worker and in ten minutes by the Russian. The Chinese does it perhaps within 40 minutes. We have to reduce this inequality which is a curse and a big obstacle to progress of the world as a whole. Whenever we talk of this inequality in production then people are either discouraged or put it off lightly. They feel that I have raised a problem of very great dimension.

Indeed it is so, the world will be equal only when the disparity in production in ended. I don't say that there should be absolute equality but comparatively men's labour should yield almost equal production, whether it be in India, or in Russia or in America. Suppose somebody says that Indian workers are lazy and work less; all right, then recognize the defect and prepare them to work. If man is one family then the problems of all its inmates have to be solved. Today America and Russia do not consider this fact. They think that by merely propagating about foreign aid they are trying to solve these problems. I think that it is this inequality of production that is maddening China today, and which ought to madden India too; but China is not aware of this cause and so it is behaving like a mad animal. China expected to solve all problems through the old methods, whatever Karl Marx has written. But that would not do, because internationalism cannot prevail as long as nationalism, the greatest thing of today's world, is there. Not only America but Russia also as compared to China has an unequal production, China and India are victims. Similarly, there is imperialism of land. Only because of some silly accidents of history one person occupies one mile in Australia or Siberia, 9 persons live on one square mile in California and in India 350 people live on one square mile. Sometimes I feel that Indians who are engaged in bhoodan should go in for international bhoodan instead of wasting their time here. After all the Russians who live in Russia today, were not there 800 years ago. These are all historical accidents. Even Americans were not in America till some time ago. If man is one family then we shall have to consider these matters also. Mere population control and family planning will not do. We should not try to solve big problems through petty methods. I put these two aspects of socialism before you. Inequality of production is there, simultaneously international responsibility is also there. When imperialism of production and of space ends, then only the world will be one and there will be a world order in which inequality will be finished in the true sense. So far there has been co-existence of good and evil in the world, this co-existence cannot continue for ever. Now there is the atom bomb. Now the world will have to choose between good and evil. It seems that this selection will have been done by 2000 A.D.

12

THE MEANING OF EQUALITY

RAMMANOHAR LOHIA

The case of equality has not before been stated comphrehensively. In other words, the complete meaning of equality has not been adequately investigated. Equality is perhaps as high an aim of life as truth or beauty. But this aim has not been investigated in serenity. Its direct and immediate repercussions on day-by-day life, on property and income and the general ordering of society, are deep and many. They din of battle does not quieten nor its dust settle down for a total and serene examination of equality.

Human experience of certain categories has also tended to cast a cloud over the prospects of equality as a high or supreme aim of life. Men have been known to work comparatively well under the temptation of profit, if they are independent, or fear of dismissal, if they are workmen, or under a system which combines temptation and fear. Such systems, which depend on temptation and fear for their dynamism and growth, must inevitably breed inequality. Inequality has thus come to be regarded as a part of human nature. Capitalism, when it is not decaying, glories in what it calls the humanity of inequality. No satisfactory substitutes for fear and greed have yet been found. Moral exhortation or pious hopes of an altruistic revolution in human nature have disfigured the examination of equality as much as irrational, shortsighted, and narrowly selfish abuse heaped upon it. Whether equality corresponds to human nature or not is a secondary question, when primary issues are raised, such as what constitutes a

high aim of life and how it is best attained.

In one way or another, all high aims of life have tended to link up with an imagined existence after death. The attainments of the short span of an individual life are so evanescent and the sorrows and tribulations affecting it so troublesome that a state after death gives comfort and hope and also purpose. The world's most impressive words are tied up with the pleasures of heaven or the pains of hell, and a high aim of life must has in some way be able to awaken similer impressions. No hard yet sung greater poetry than on the immortality of the soul. A few equally great verses have indeed been composed on the somewhat allied subject of the indestructible unity of the universe. But, the possibility of the cheerful existence after death, whether in heaven or as a result of impersonal salvation, has always been mixed up with such verses and philosophy. Impersonal salvation is indeed a more satisfying sequel to death than individualized heaven, but then the question arises as to the need of such supreme aims of life as truth and goodness, when all is a nameless void. To this complex question, some kind of an answer has been made.

The concept of salvation after death has given birth to the complementary notion of salvation in life. Only he shall be saved after death who is already saved in life. On this, everybody, those who affirm as also those who deny existence after death, may be agreed that the highest aim of life is to be able to receive death will when it comes. This preparation for death must necessarily mean the living of life in a unique fashion : on the lowest planes, absence of regret, and on the highest, the undimmed presence of bliss and happiness. Can a life such as this be lived without the supreme principle of equality ? When bards sang of the indestructible unity of the universe, they were thrilled with two discoveries : first that the universe is all of one piece and therefore every part is the equal of another; second, that every part of the universe could sense the joy of being co-extensive with all of it. All men of joy have variously wanted to be the tree whose sap rises with the wind, or the kid that gambols after its mother, or the star whose twinkle reveals as much as it deepens its mystery, not to talk of fellow creatures of the human species. Reason is a potent instrument of understanding but so is the direct and intutive felling of unity and equality. It is true that the desire to be a tree or a star, permanenty divorced from reason, may lead to futility, but the effort at exclusive logic, permanently divorced from the poetry of

equality, may as well lead to cruelty. To be able to sense the indestructible unity of the universe is perhaps the greatest joy that can be known to man, and equality appears in this connection to be a necessary state of mind.

Whether the ego is to be expanded so as to become sensitive and related to all the universe or it is to be reduced to a nullity in pursuit of that aim is a secondary question of method. The primary issue is to feel the joy of being one with the universe, of being equal with everything in it. Such a spiritual and emotional kinship appears to be a main quality of equality as a high aim of life. In a family, this kinship obtains, Its foundation is bulit on an almost total material equality. No matter what the earnings of individual members may be or if they do not earn anything at all, as in the case of children and old parents, the family is in food and dress a compact unit, and the requirements of its members are equally met. An unblemished kinship must reign in the family. Between parents and childern and husband and wife, and also brothers and sisters and such like in an extended family, an almost total unity and total equality amounting to almost total surrender and scarifice, in most cases undeliberately and instinctively, must prevail. To the extent that a family loses in this quality of kinship, to that extent it also loses in this quality as a family. A close parallelism of spiritual equality with material equality and the joy based on it is a part of human nature at least in the restricted sphere of the family. But, the attempts, to spread this kinship to the entire human family has never yet succeeded; it has always floundered on the rock of the self which, while it is generous within the confines of the individual family, becomes narrow when confronted with the magnitude of the human family.

The fatherhood of God and the brotherhood of man are exhortutions. They have not yet become part of human nature. They are at best ethical appeals. They have no foundation in the emotions of man. They can have none in the existing human situations. When material inequality among the nations and within a nation becomes so gross as to be outside the competence of the individual, his conscience becomes so classic as to suit it. Little do men realize how much their conscience is a matter of habit and routine and also the comforts of the body. An ever-alert conscience would be suicidally generous. In the midst of the

widespread poverty and misery of backward countries, it would not know how to survive the strains of universal kinship. Conscience in such a case would either die singly or together with the body. In like manner, disparities between the white peoples are so gross that it is ridiculous to talk of human brotherhood. The human mind faces such disparities in its usual style of becoming part luminous and part dark, so as to get attuned to the habitual routines of life. A European would probably be shocked at the idea of another European pulling him in a rickshaw, but he does not think twice of riding in a rickshaw driven by an Asian. Between those whose average per head consumption of milk reaches a daily half kilo and such as have to be content with less than a spoonful, there can be no kinship. Something much more elemental than an ethical appeal will have to be brought into operation, something that churns the individual as well as society.

A glimpse of such a churning is visible in the sphere of national kinship as distinct from that of human kinship. The elements of pride, of hunour, and of hurt nationality are brought into play, and these comparatively selfish emotions achive a kinship within the nation that ethical perceptions are unable to do. The sight of a leper or beggar, an ill-clad or an emaciated man may not move a more fortunate national of the same country to kinship, but it does move him to anger and pride and the desire to do something about it, unless he has become so loathsome and meanly selfish as to feel contempt. This national kinship achieved through the backdoor of selfish pride or hurt is sometimes to be found as a unifying sentiment amongst all coloured peoples and, more rarely, among all the poor or oppressed peoples of the earth, white or coloured.

It may also be that the sentiment of human brotherhood has so far rested on the comparatively fragile foundations of ethics and morals. A super spiritual foundation rooted in the high aims of life might have proved stronger. A high aim of life such as truth or beauty is as personal as it is impersonal. It may drive a man to unsettling deeds. It may also drive him to a complete renovation of himself. In similar manner, the high aim to sense the joy of unity of the universe and equality of all parts in it may become stunted and comparatively futile when it is restricted to the sphere of morals, but it may renovate the individual and

explode his society if it is spiritually encompassed. After all, the joy of sensing the unity of the universe is an intimate and a personal joy, the greatest ever likely to man, however, much its sequel may be impersonal. Such an intimate joy would impel man to combine with others in the effort to explode current society with its disparities. The moral business of trying to do good is pale by comparison. It is also restrictive.

The moral concept of human brotherhood restricts the individual holding it to the species of man in the universe, not even to all animate beings, not to talk of all that is in the universe. Such a restricting is serial. Once it starts with man, it easily goes up to the national kinsman, and in most cases to the nearer kinsman of the tribe, class, or caste. Restrictive emotions are hostile to the joy that lies in the unity of the universe. A restrictive philosophy of humanism may therefore kill joy as much as it may bog down society in its existing order. On the other hand, it is hard to feel unity and kinship with the bug, the mosquitio, the snake and other such life forms unless it be through hypocritical devices common to certain Hindu and Jain sects, which make them clean their water, and in some cases the air they breathe, of all possible germs, but permit them to drink the unfiltered blood of exploitation. It is also well to understand that vegetarianism, when it becomes compulsive or a matter or routine, may become exceedingly cruel. For those who propose to sense the unity and equality of the universe, there are many pitfalls of dead routine and aggresive cruelty. But they may also attain the greatest joy possible to man on earth. And they may also become the world's greatest revolutionaries insofar as they introduce the parallelism of spiritual equality and kinship, and the material equality of living standards

It is a matter of great surprise that former ages could think of the indestructible unity of the universe and did not at the same time think of or strive for material equality within the human race. The joy of unity is impossible without the feeling of kinship. The feeling of kinship is impossible without material equality, at least to the fullest possible degree. Disparities of wealth were not so pronounced in those early times when men sang of unity of the universe. Poverty may also not have existed in such gross forms as those of today, perhaps because populations were small and lands were extensive. In any event, emotional kinship

with one's fellow men is impossible unless it is rooted in material equality.

As an abstract concept and generalization, equality can only mean an atomosphere, an emotion, and perhaps also a wish that all arrangements, political, social, or economic, shall be equal as between one individual and another. What equality of arrangement means in such a case is left for the wish and the dream of the person concerned. Dreams have a double-edged quality. They may have no bearing on reality. They may on the other hand make men move and explode their order. The essential point is that equality, unless it is expressed in concrete terms, is an atmosphere, an emotion, a wish, or a dream.

The last 400 years of human history mean European history. There is always such a situation in history that a portion of mankind dominates over the rest and the history of that section becomes the history of all mankind. In the last 400 years, there has been a very clear movement of equality in various spheres of European life, from the legal over the social and the political into the present phase of economic equality.

Legal equality is equality before the law. In a law court, the judge is not expected to recognize differences in social status between one individual and another, and applies a single law irrespective of their social situation. The law of theft, for instance. operates on all men alike. The rich man may in certain situations obtain the benefit of the doubt by employing skilled counsel, although the judge may be highly scrupulous.

Once legal equality was established, the phase of political equality came. Political equality means the equality of the adult vote. Until recently, the vote . was tied up with property and educational qualifications, and the women's vote is a comparatively recent acquisition. In a number of what may otherwise be called advanced countries, women do not yet possess the right of voting. However, men in general has moved from legal equality to political equality.

Economic equality in the sense of an increasing standards of living to everbody within national frontiers has become a common element of all ideologies. Every European aspires for a better standard of living. A sample of economic equality as it is currently practised by Europeans and Americans may be drawn from domestic service. A domestie servant is required by the law to

possess a room of his or her own. The law in West European countries requires that domestic servants have a right to leisure and privacy. Looking at the clothes and faces of men and women in West European capitals, one would not know to which class a person belongs. A stage has been reached where they all look alike from a distance. From the point of view of basic essentials of life, namely, minimum food, minimum clothes, and in a sense minimum housing, Europeans have thus been provided a basis of equality within the nation.

In the Scandinavian and most European countries, every child is given an annual subsidy of around Rs. 600 from birth up to 14 years of age. Similarly, every old person, after around 55 years of age, is paid a pension, which varies from one country to another, generally in the neighbourhood of Rs. 1,600 a year. Every unemployed person receives a monthly allowance in most European lands and America which may range between Rs. 100 in some areas of Europe to Rs 500 in America.

Food subsides are also granted. Some time back milkmen of Stockholm were not able to sell milk at the prevailing price. The price of milk per kilo was six annas; they desired to sell it at six annas and one pice. Their case was examined by trade unions, government, and other agencies and found to be genuine. The decision was difficult, and it almost caused a crisis of opinion inside the cabinet. Whether the excess price of one pice should be paid by the consumer or the government was the question that engaged them seriously. Ultimately, the government decided to subsidize. Instead of the consumer, the tax-payer and the entire population bore the burden.

The general concept of equality is an atmosphere, a wish, a dream which is translated into concrete equality of one type or another with definite meaning, like equality before the law, the equality of food subsidy, a servent possessing a house, children's allowance, unemployment allowance. old age pension, and the like. These are all concrete ideas of equality, the welfare state in practice. People talking of a welfare state in India just do not know what it means.

A universal experience of all mankind in all ages and climes is to mistake passing objects of history for the enduring. A revolver, for instance, was for a very long period considered a tool of equality. Physical inequality among individuals which resulted in bullying and cringing was removed by the revolver, and, apparently,

equality was thus achieved. In this as in every other such argument, we should be warned against the exuberance of temporary effects. The argument of the revolver is patently wrong. There are certain skills, for example, jujitsu or handling of machines, whereby physical inequality is sought to be removed. Yet, inequality remains, for skills keep on developing in an unequal way. The revolver is developed over numerous stages into the hydrogen bomb. We must be likewise warned against acceptance of journalistic beliefs and scientific fications such as the impending age of atomic plenty. Exhibitions are run to demonstrate the atomic age. It has always been so whenever a new discovery is made. There is no single scientfic invention of steam or of electricty which was not heralded with the trumpet of plenty and prosperity, but which did not settle down into a further deepening of riches on the one hand, and misery on the other. The dream of equality which man sees in temporary and passing events is a fancy and chimera.

Let us first examine the relationship between abstract equality as a dream and concrete equality as an existent in an age and country. All talk of equality as a general concept without a concrete meaning that accompanies it is either hypocrisy or lethargy of the mind. Similarly, all talk that restricts itself to just one formula of equality is the establishment of *status quo.* The Socialist movement in India has for instance fixed that the proportion of lowest and highest incomes should not vary beyond the range of 1 to 10. Without such a fixed ratio, all talk of generalized equality would either be hypocrisy or mental laziness. It would result in man having two compartments, the abstract and the concrete, in his mind, which are barred and bolted against each other. The 1 to 10 concept must not, however, be accepted as a permanent and eternally valid principle. This would open the dreadful possibility of the mind becoming adjusted to superstitious and routine thinking. All great religious sects which began with the struggle for equality got frozen in course of time by customs and manners. That is how a revolutionary becomes a victim of frozen ideas. The mind that has accepted material equality must remain supple enough for increasing apporoximation, further to reduce the ratio.

The abstract and the concrete should be so understood in their relationship that connection with reality is not lost, nor are concrete requirements stated in such low terms that the objective

ever remains a distant peak. Maximum and immediate attainability relevant to the current situation in relationship to the ideal is the touchstone. To realize the ideal of economic equality, statecraft requires such a concrete concept as is based on maximum and immediate attainability of the cherished end. If one is overwhelmed by the current situation, one become a conservative or reactionary; if one adopts an unrealizable aim, one becomes irrelevant. Idealism borders on insanity, but practicability also verges on reaction; to be idealistic may sometimes mean to be insane, just as to be practical may as weel mean to be reactionary.

Conservatives often make use of skilled rhetoric in this connection; they talk of levelling up as the distinct from levelling down. They accuse Socialists of wanting to level down. Actually, however, there must be both levelling up and levelling down in any programme for equality. In fact, the levelling down will take place somewhat earlier than the levelling up, although this unavoidable chronological sequence must not lead to a logical sequence in the mind. All those who talk of one part of the programme without the other are either reactionary, if they talk alone of levelling up, or insane, if they restrict themselves to levelling down.

The European mind suffers from the disease of identifying the abstract and the concrete. European Communists tend to identify the concrete in Russia with their abstract. On the other hand, European democrats tend to identify the current position in America or West Europe with the abstract of their democracy. Communists and democrats accept the concept of progress in history. There is, therefore, always an object which they choose and in which the goal is embodied Once the identification of the real with the ideal is achieved, one becomes slavishly loyal and the mind refuses to understand. It can either justify or accuse, but cannot understand.

India suffers from the disease of total separation of the abstract and the concrete. Elements of religion also come into the picture and cause the divorce between the abstract and the concrete to become complete. The mind continually practices dishonesty by separating the abstract and the concrete. All debates become futile when concrete items of fundamental import are dismissed a programmatic details and abstractions are discussed in a vacuum. That is not only so amongst the parties but also within the parties. Ideologies and principles are in fact programmes in the long run,

just as programmes are principles and ideologies in the short run. A programme of action is a concretized principle, and a programme of principle is a generalized action or detail. In India especially, this disease of divorce of the abstract from the concrete is almost universal. The abstract and the concrete must stay as two distinct compartments in the mind. But there must be continual back and forth between the two, almost like the ceaseless ticking of the heart. Europe has demolished the wall between the two compartments, and the mind is just one open field, where the abstract and the concrete are identical. India has sealed the two compartments off against each other, and the mind has split into two parts, so that the abstract and the concrete are totally separated. Mankind has now reached the stage when its mind must naturally recognize as separate the two identities of the abstract and the concrete but must constantly enact their internaction and interplay.

One must think of equality both in the background of historical equality and in the background of the relationship between abstract and concrete equalities. Lipstick and the revolver may be considered as equalizers, but neither adequate nor unadequate. They represent a search for equality. But such searches also realize unexpected and contrary aims. The art of being able to trace a concept and statement to its more general as well as to its more particular form is indispensable for an examination of the meaning of equality. Every concept and statement has its more general and its more particular forms; tools of thought should be so designed as to aid us to trace it back and forth in either form.

The achievement of equality is difficult not only because of the current existence of inequality but also because of certain errors of thought. Equality, for instance, is not equality in food, which is difficult and unwholesome. An equal portion of food means the equality of prison, a fixed ration. This example should have no meaning beyond showing that the concept of equality must be well understood to bear fruit. In the Israeli Kibbutz, explorations into equality, both sensible and comic, have been made. Everybody eats food in these settlements not equally, but according to his hunger. But clothes are provided equally, say two or three shirts each. Housing is equal. Very curious intellectual debates sometimes take place in these settlements. One such curious debate took place concerning whether children should be allowed to live

with their mothers or be brought up in a separate nursery, as was the practice until then. The younger generation and the newer entrants, who had no tradition of suffering behind them, wanted children to be allowed to live with their mothers. The purer variety of collectivists and those who had suffered for their beliefs thought that individualism would creep in as a seed of inequality if children were not brought up in a common nursery. The newer entrants won.

Communist countries in the first five years of their rule tried to make university education free. Then they reintroduced the fee. They found it impossible to continue the system of free education at the university level. Eduction in Oxford and Cambridge Universities is eminently aristocratic to an Indian, but actually, about 80 per cent of the students at these universities are sons and daughters of ordinary men, who pass out high and are given municipal and other scholarships. There may be no single way to achieve an aim, but a combination of several ways.

Equality has various aspects. Soviet Russia, for instance, appears to have attained the best yet recorded in providing mass medicine and primary education to the population as a whole. In specialized instruction and medicine, Germany or America still hold the field, and all West Europe and America still constitute the top in the matter of minimum food and clothes so pleasing to the soul.

Certain inequalities are stubborn. The most comfortable palace of today easily becomes the slum of tomorrow, and ordinary middle-class homes are superior to it for having more modern equipments of comfort. One may make housing sites equal: but a locality may still remain more important or healthy than others. General awareness of such problems must grow.

While we are generally aware of the inequalities of birth and wealth, we should also be warned against those caused by eloquence and talent. In the Socialist movement in India, the greatest single quality of a leader appears to be his capacity to make speeches; there are occasions when a single excellent speech, ensures its maker election to executive positions. He becomes the conference hero, thought he may be lazy, otherwise indisciplined, or utterly rotten. A political party must also think of remedies to this unequal talent of speech-making which is socially useless unless supported by courage and wisdom. The capacities to espouse

unpopular causes and act against the government and face suffering are all important qualities, socially more useful than speech-making. Wisdom is not necessarily eloquence. Courage acquires in course of time an unmatched eloquence. Gandhiji had no eloquence, and yet his audience hung on every word he said because of his constant practice of saying only that which he felt and did.

Let no one corrupt or degrade his endeavour by trying to become the equal of another in the sense of arrogating equality without having the right to it. Each of us can excel in one department of life or another. But we should not ape our neighbour. Our capacities and personalities may lie in a department separate from his. One may to some extent correctly interpret equality to mean the desire to possess a motor car because some one else possesses it. The question may arise, why only one car and not two, and why not a better car. The desire for equality in the modern world has become the desire for being similar and not equal. The effort to be equal both in the collective and individual spheres will be corrupted if it simply become the desire to be alike.

Material equality among nations appears more difficult to achieve than material equality within the nation. It is true that the one is dependent on the other. No nation can long remain equal within its frontiers if it is unequal against those outside. As water finds its level, so human society tends to approximate to its lowest levels, unless these levels are otherwise raised. The yearly income of the average American has reached up to around Rs. 5,500. The yearly income of the average Indian lags behind at around Rs, 200. Capital per head in America has gone well beyond Rs. 15,000. Capital per head in India is probably nearer Rs. 200 than Rs. 300, These distances relate to averages of the two lands, and the distance between the minimum in India and the maximum in America would be immeasurably larger. There can be no such aim as a one-to-ten ratio in relation to averages which must necessarily be equal or almost equal. These are the rockbottom facts of the human universe as it exists today. They are more or less applicable to all the prosperious nations on the one hand and the poverty-stricken peoples on the other. All contemplation of equality is meaningless unless these facts are ever there at the back of the mind.

Pathetic belief in an age of plenty consequent upon scientific inventions amounts to surrender of reason. A political and economic structure will have to be consciously designed such as would close the gap within the nation and among nations. It is extremely doubtful if existing industrial techology can achieve such an aim. This technology began amongst a certain set of conditions; one, scarcer populations and larger lands; two, handsome capital and machines per head of the population; three, industrial production for all the world carried out in a few West European lands. These were unique historical conditions. They cannot be duplicated. It is somewhat incomprehensible how the technology attendant on those conditions can be reproduced without them. Much human thought is waste, largely because such abstractions as capitalism, industrialization, socialism, and the like are made to do for various sets of unique and irreproducible conditions of history. But this is only an incidental argument. Whether current patterns of science and technology can achieve an age of plenty for all the world or whether new patterns will have to be devised may be left to history to decide What is already decided is that the human race must make strenuous efforts of thought and action to devise an economic and political structure that will embody the revolution of equality.

Men who have tasted of the joy of equality and unity within the universe can never stay content until the fullest possible material equality is realized. Such complete equality may never be attained; at least, it may be ages away. But, the end of equality must live in the mind more poignantly than the current experience of inequality. Such a mind would be lit up with the passion for increasing approximation both within the nation and among nations. Gaps would be closed. Disparities would be removed. Political and economic structures would be sought to be realized such as would embody in a revolutionary way the increasing material approximation of one man to another irrespective of any frontiers whatever.

One may note in passing that such a passion in equality would co-exist with a sharp introspection. Two evils are manifesting themselves in the current Indian situation, and they are probably universal to the human race. Equality as against those placed above one's own station in life is easy to practice, for, in certain situations, jealously and bitterness come easiest to man. Equality

as against those placed below one's own station in life is comparatively hard of practice, for sympathy is consuming both materially and spiritually, although a source of great joy after one has experienced it. A passion for equality would not restrict itself to the practice of sympathy; it would also practice anger though not jealousy.

Another accompanying evil is the effort of broad sections to lift themselves up with the lever of bitterness and jealousy rather than the development of their talents. This is particularly the case in a situation where tens of centuries have specialized some classes into mental pursuits and mort others into mannual work. These oppressed castes tend to throw up a leadership which specializes in the demagogy of jealousy in order to attain equality with the classes of power and wealth Men of real ability even within they oppressed castes are left behind and get no chance to develop themselves, for those more adept at the strident voice of jealousy easily outrun them. Mankind loses. Egalitarians must be ever aware of the need to develop the outlook and telents of all men, particularly of those oppressed, as much as to fight for equality against the unwilling usurpers of inequality. The usurpers of inequality possess certain virtues, particularly of efficiency and manners, and the crusaders of equality must ever breed their virtues in their own ranks.

We must beware of how we seek to realize equality in different spheres. For each aspect of material equality, a method should be sought that corresponds to its nature. Otherwise unexpected and contrary results may follow. Compulsion, persuasion, and example are the three time-honoured modes of change. Any other mode of change is not possible in theory, at least has not been so in history hitherto. But, the proper limits of these various modes of change have not yet been drawn. Example, persuasion, and compulsion each have their limits. In the absence of a proper study of these limits, ignorance or fanaticism may yield results contrary to those aimed for.

To give an instance, vegetarianism, non-smoking, and non-drinking are variously regarded as virtues and desirable conduct. Vegetarianism has in fact an indirect bearing on the problem of equality, and in poorer lands smoking and drinking might also be however remotely connected. But, a grave error of judgment would arise if those who uphold vegetarinism; non-smoking, and

non-drinking were to practise helter-skelter all the three modes of change. Vegetarianism, for instance, must under no circumstances go beyond the mode of personal example. Non-smoking may, together with personal example, sometimes bring to its aid the mode of persuation. Stoppage of alcohol may perhaps in certain circumstances and over temporary periods be furthered by a ban alongside of persuasion and example. Even in the case of non-drinking, one need not be too dogmatic of the virtues of total compulsion. In any event, the barriers are clear.

While the mode of personal example appears to be universal in application, persuasion has a comparatively smaller scope but, even so, extends over a much larger area than that of compulsion. There should be no need to add that compulsion must alone mean that of the law or of civil disobedience. A government practises compulsion through the law, and an opposition practises compulsion through civil disobedience. No other form of compulsion need be entertained, for equality can never be achieved through spilling of blood. But there is need to clarify further the mode of personal example and fix its meaning. A situation has currently arisen in India, and is probably universal to man, in which personal example is more an affair of advising the other fellow what be should do rather than that of precept and practice in one's own life. Such a situation arises in egalitation movements particularly.

A first error arises when it is expected that a person carry out at once in his life a desired change that he and his party may be advocating. Advocacy of a ceiling on land or income is thus supposed to require immediate execution, even before it is law, by the advocate, at least for himself. Nothing would be better the if the advocate did it. His personal example would be infectious, but to require him to do it shows a complete error of thought. Men bear the law willingly because it is universally applied. If it were to be applied to one class of persons and not to another, particularly when the law means, deprivation of some kind, it would not be fair or wise to expect advocates of equality, to live on an island of total virtue. Such advocates of equality must undoubtedly ever reform themselves, should they happen to be beneficiaries of inequality either through birth or skill. If they are genuine they will unstintingly place their resources in the service of their ideal. They will also contiuually change their lives so as to

approximate increasingly to their ideal.

Increasing approximation within the nation and also among nations seems most difficult to obtain. It appears even more difficult to maintain, should it somehow be realised at any time. Unless all mankind is spritually seized by the high aim of equality and increasing approximation, usurping nations and classes which have built themselves on inequality and armed power will intervene and suppress efforts towards total equality. There is only one way to escape this predicament. Exceptional men have exceptionally emerged in all human history who have practised this way, from Prahlad over Socrates to Gandhi. The 20th century has for the first time in human history seen how ordinary men can practise the way of exceptional men, perhaps as yet more often collectively than individually.

This is the simple way of saying no to the tyrant, the usurper, and the exploiter. Mankind must increasingly learn this art of saying no without the aid of weapons. It is an art that invites great and self-imposed suffering. And, on balance, if it is certainly less costly than the art and skill of inflicting suffering on others. Furthermore, it is the only way. The total meaning of equality is interwoven with saying no to the usurper and exploiter without the aid of weapons. Dependence on weapons renders a man helpless, both when he does not have them and when he does not possess enough of them or the more potent ones. The total meaning of equality can never blossom in the midst of such dependence and helplessness. Mankind must increasingly breed the new man who will individually and collectively learn to say no to the usurpers.

The world will be full of strife and sorrow, but also joy and victory, and, in any case, unending toil for a long time to come, if not forever. Man will run a perilous risk if he models his behaviour on the hope of a golden future. He must currently change his life of pettiness and fill it with joy, for he has only a short span of life to prepare for a fitting reception to his individual death. Meanwhile, he may continue to hope for a golden future. In all this, he will be tossed between pleasure and pain, heat and cold, victory and defeat, sorrow and joy. His thought and action will be ever contaminated by contrary sets of streams of experience. Pride, greed, jealousy, vanity, fear, domineering, the urge to exploit, and the accompanying artifices of deceit, lies, and murder will beset his path. Neither material equality nor emotional kinship can thrive in

such a climate.

The modern mind has forgotten yet another meaning of equality, its most inward meaning. Man must strive to feel an inward equality between contrary conditions of pleasure and pain, heat and cold, victory and defeat. The ancients in India seemed to have sensed that inward equanimity and outward equality were two sides of the same coin, for, alone in India's languages, does a single word stand for both meanings. *Samata or Samatvam* is the word. It may be easily countered that such a state of tranquality amidst contrary conditions is not possible. That would not be wholly true to say, for such a tranquility has ever in the past been possible to those who have prepared themselves for it. Why should it not be possible to all or almost all of mankind ?

Undoubtedly, the law of the body must prevail. The body must necessarily experience heat and cold or pleasure and pain varyingly. But, the mind that senses these experiences may have at its back another mind that only sees. In such a situation, every experience will-be grasped by a knower who will also be its seer. The mind of man will simultaneously know and see an experience. This happens almost always during minor mishaps. When a man elips, not too badly and without much hurt, on the skin of a banana, he experiences the fall and its displeasure, but is also amused by it and tries to laugh it away. This is perhaps done in order to avoid the embarrassing gave of one's fellow men, and, in any event, the experience relates to an event of low and uncommon order. But, the phenomenon proves that man is capable of being amused at his own experience.

This amusement may come out of spiritual training or refinement of culture, as much as it may be sequel to embarrassment or similar reactions of a lower order. Through constant training, man may acquire a state in which he will both know and see his experience of victory and defeat or pleasure and pain. He will undoubtedly feel the joy or the sorrow, as it is difficult to see how a person who is aware can make himself insensitive to outward happenings. But he will also be amused at his own sorrow of joy pleasure or pain, and, while sensing them perhaps even actively, he will be continually restored to equanimity through a background of amusement. It is this amusement which provides an undercurrent of delight in all his experiences to the man who trains himself to equality between varying states of pleasure and pain,

Such a man will not practice deceit nor lie nor murder, and his soul shall increasingly free itself of fear or pride or urge to exploit.

Equality is thus found to be inward and outward as well as spirtual and material. Equality must therefore be grasped in all its four meanings. Material equality must mean the outward approximation among nations as well as the inward approximation within the nation. Spiritual equality must mean outward kinship, as much as it means inward equanimity. Only an integrated concept of these four meanings of equanimity, kinship material equality within the nation and among nations is worthy to become a supreme aim of life and its purpose. Men will then wonder how previous generations violated human nature by confining kinship and material equality within the individual family and refusing to extend it over the entire human family. Truly immortal words will then be sung on the unity of the universe alongside of its economic equality, kinship, and tranquility.

13

FOREIGN POLICY*

RAMMANOHAR LOHIA

The world after the war is repeating most of the outward expression in the pre-war period. Europe, together with the US, holds the attention of the world. The sources of war or peace, progress or reaction, still seem to lie in Europe.

Most men, including our countrymen, talk their opinions from newspapers. These are full of the same old rivalries, the Anglo-Russian or the Russo-American, with sometimes a hint of conflict between England and the US thrown in. The issues on which these rivalries express themselves are changing, but events, such as make the world nervous about its fate or sanguine by turn, are still woven around the words that fall from the lips of American or Russia or British statesman. Even in its stupid aspect of the small countries of Europe and their petty conflicts outwardly threatening peace, the world before the war is reapting itself.

The result is that the common man, also in Asia, is made to detect the basic feature of the international situation in Europe and the US, and he is led to believe that its most important aspect is the Russo-American rivalry. This belief tends in make him conclude, as he did before the war, that two worlds, one Capitalist and the other Communist, are poised in conflict with each other. The six years of war when two parts of the world were ranged against each other, not on the basis of their ideology or their social

*From *Policy Statement*, Socialist Party, 1949.

structure but on the basis of their national interests and other factors, seem to have made no difference either to men's beliefs or to the world's manifestations.

Is this outward vision of the world true ? Do the seeds of peace or war, of progress or reaction, lie in the Russo-American rivalry or in any of the inter-European conflicts ? Any Socialist must ask himself this question, in particular an Indian or an Asian Socialist.

Indeed, the picture seems to be all too true in its Asian revelations. In the midst of the war, the Big Four on the Allied side included China, and the other camp had Japan. The Allied camp has own, and the Big Four are three of them in Europe and the Fourth in the American Continent. Asia is completely eliminated from the supreme councils of the world, and Africa and most countries of the Americas continue to appear to be what they were.

And yet underneath these outward shadows and the false film of an abstract capitalist-Communist conflict is the gigantic shift in the power of continents, the great drive towards national freedom and towards a world whose constituent powers are equal in prosperity. Sometimes the obscuring film bursts, and, except that our eyes are too long acustomed to an inadequate vision, this mighty continental shift is there for all to see. From Cairo to Canton, they cry everywhere is "quit." Even those who raise this cry underrate themselves and each other, and their eyes are fastened on the doings of others. And yet the keynote of our country is this cry and the great continental shift and the freedom of nations. Not the abstract capitalist Communist conflict, but the concrete colonial-imperial conflict is the basic feature of the international situation today.

The politics of this continental shift have their firm basis in world economy. The countries of the world yield an abysmally unequal return to every man-hour of labour. Between the US and Hindustan, the ratio of returns to man's labour is 20 : 1. Barring minor variations, this ratio operates between West Europe and the US on the one hand and Hindustan and other retarded economies on the other.

It is this economic fact more than any other that influnces the entire complex of the worlds today. The world struggling to be born is essentially one of which man, whether in the US or Hindustan,

gets a comparatively equal return for his labour, while the world that is, attempts in large part to repress such outcome. This attempt at repression is foolish, for the precondition of an expansive world economy is expansion of the productive equipment of retarded economies. Until tools and the system through which retarded peoples produce their wealth are so altered as to bring their production on par with advanced economies, the world will suffer poverty and slumps, rivalries and wars. Such an altering will probably have to be brought about through a new techinique.

Who wants to expand the production of Hindustan and China and such like countries and is striving for it ? Who is opposing it or claiming a share in the contracting spoils, and who is sitting on the fence ? The answer to these questions will largely determine the enduring role of a group in the international field.

Socialist are wont to describe the world of today as a contradiction between surplus value and wages, between forces of production, in short, as the expression of class struggle. These phrases awaken the anguish of indequacy. While it may be correct to fix upon the class struggle as an impulse of any single economy, world economy as a whole is rocked by the still more powerful struggle of nations. One wishes there were a single phrase that combined these two economic features of the world, the class struggle on the one hand and the conflict between free productivity and shackled productivity on the other.

The colonial-imperial conflict from Cairo to Canton and in the Middle and South American countries is economically and politically of more enduring consequences. Without its resolving, the equipment of retarded economies, and therefore world production cannot expand. But men's beliefs, even those of acute sufferes as in Hindustan, and institutional action, such as in the UNO, lag behind the realities.

The question whether the returns to labour can be made fairly equal in all parts of the world has an economic as well as a political aspect. We are not concerned here with its economic practicability. Suffice it to say that this must be done. Its politics, however, are obvious. Without overthrow of the rule of one nation over another, science will continue to be a monopoly. Agriculture and industry in retarded economies will stay deprived its application.

Also, this overthrow appears unavoidably to be attended by

revolts and wars. The mid-war rebellion of Hindustan and disturbances afterwards, the turmoil in Egypt, in Indonesia and Indo-China, and the crisis in China are examples of how the new world is made to fight against the old. West Europe, unable to expand, is yet blindly afraid of letting go its political grip in the world; the US, although in part expansive, is in large measure the leader of the world as it is; Soviet Rusia, essentially a European power, is plainly after national strength to the point of obscurring it under an international garb.

The revolts and wars of today may yet cultimate in another world war. But, the obscurring film may fuddle men's eyes and the world appears to be divided into two camps, the leaders of either being in Europe and the US. Against this the world must guard itself.

In fact, the only way to avoid a world war or to shorten it when it comes, is to increase continually the strength of Asia, Africa, and Middle and South America, so that the armed might of advanced economies may quail before it. A Socialist in these countries must be an assertive nationalist. Indeed, a Socialist in the US or Europe would do well to fix his eyes on the political strength of these retarded countries. The battleground of progress versus reaction has already shifted here, although it may be some years before this fact is universally recognized and made part of man's habitual background.

The movements of freedom from foreign rule everywhere and particularly in East Asia have been more than the effort to overthrow foreign rule. They have also been economic and social movements directed against the old order, especially the feudal order which allied itself with foreign rule everywhere. The end ofimperialism in many of these countries, as also the the end of militarism in Japan, has necessarily meant the emergence of Socialist or Socialist-dominated governments. Even where this has not already taken place, as in India and China, the orentation of the people and the country's politics is towards socialism and away from capitalism. At the same time, the progress of the peoples towards socialism is not restricted to the working class as in European countries: the exploited classes which have hitherto struggled for freedom and are now struggling for socialism are as much farmers and city dwellers as factory labourers. Such a general advance of the Asian and other peoples to socialism opens out a wholly new and glorious

perspective for world socialism.

The international idea is today vitiated by the domination of two powerful states, each with its own satellites seeking to divide the world it resources, and all human relationships the two warring camps, vulgarizing the international basis of any world effort. A genuine international order can be attained only by a bloc of nations which stay independent of these two powers. The effort to reinvigorate imperialist influence in the Near West and also in North and South-East Asia threatens the integrity of the new system of sovereign States that is emerging in postwar Asia. In such a conflict of interests, the third camp stoutly supports the sovereignty of those States which are struggling to overthrow alien domination. On the Socialist forces of Asia, therefore, rests largely the responsibility of creating such a bloc in the international sphere. The Indian people already laid the foundations of third camp through their policy and action in the war years.

The Socialist Party is willing to assume its share of responsibility for achieving genuine international action. The Socialist Party in India desires close contact with the Socialist parties in the world. It is determined to strengthen the Socialist elements in every country and to resist with all its might the concentrated efforts of international combinations to frustrate the people's assertion of their rights. It welcomes the effort of the British Labour Party to socialize Britain, as it is on the side ot the Indonesian Republic when it is beating back the Dutch assault. The Soclalist Party assures its fullest support to such peoples and governments as are battling against attacks to smother freedom or obstruct their progress to socialism.

The Inter-Asian Conference which met in India was a good beginning. It had its numerous blemishes. A later conference will perhaps be more representative, have a carefully planned agenda, and fix as its pivotal theme the vigorous pursuit of political power and of equal returns to man's labour in all countries of the world.

Likewise, the Socialists of India must plan for a world Socialist conference, which will divest socialism of many of its bases and accretions that are essentially West European. Democratic socialism as opposed to dictatorial communism of limited application, well aware of its essential task to increase the political strength of retarded peoples as much as to abolish capitalism may

then become a conscious tool of world progress.

The foreign policy of India is being formed. We must achieve the most friendly relations with our neighbours Lanka (Ceylon), Burma, Malaya, Viet Nam, Indonesia, Tibet, Afghanistan, Iran, Iraq, East Africa, and others, not only because we can know each other better than we can distant peoples, but also because India has a role to play in building up their political strength and economic prosperity. Our friendship with the Chinese people must become unshakeable.

Our relationship with all other countries of the world must be extremely correct and, wherever possible, friendly. With the US and Russia the warmth of our relations would depend on the extent that they do not hinder the creation of strong republics of the retarded peoples. We shall have friendly relations with England after she has ceased obstructing nations in their growth. We hope that the people of Japan and Germany shall pursue with us the path of democratic socialism.

So will the new world arise. A world federation is possible in no other way. The two ways currently elevated into the competing principles of world government are those of the UNO and of the USSR. Neither can succeed.

The United Nations Organization cannot basically reduce national sovereignties. Its decisions are taken on the basis of the world as it is, with the armed forces and other sources of power in different countries so wildly varying. Such decisions are at best amending expedients. They can check a malady but cannot remove it. They cannot being nations under an international sovereignty, for they are powerless to alter materially the differences in economy and armed strength of the sovereignties of different nations.

The United Soviets of Socialist Republics are speedily contracting into a name for Russia. It cannot be otherwise. Never can a world idea mature into reality if it is linked up with the fortunes of a single country. Under Communist thinking, the achieving of a world government and the expansion of Russian reach have an interchangeable meaning.

The only way to achieve world government is the one here outlined. Disparity between free productivity and colonial productivity must be removed. Returns to man's labour must be made fairly equal, wherever he may live. Not full employment so

much as equally yielding employment is the key to a world state. The constituent parts of the world must first reach equality in power and then in prosperity, and so shall be set on the road to world government.

The Socialist Party will work for an international organization in which peace is not precariously sought at the expense of principles, in which issues are decided on the merits of the case and not on the strength of weapons, secret or other, in which no country can cancel the judgment of mankind, where fear and theats of was do not prevail, and where men and women of different countries plan through their chosen delegates of equal authority lives of plenty and joy and dignity, none higher than the other.

14

THE SEVEN REVOLUTIONS AND FIVE HIDDEN IMPERIALISMS

RAMMANOHAR LOHIA

Man has presumably always disliked injustice and tyranny. He has often enough revolted against its various manifestations. In previous centuries, these revolts did not embrance the whole earth at the same time. Nor were they all enveloping, for they were directed against one injustice or another and not all its forms. Our century is characterized by the revolt of man all over the earth against all forms of injustice at the same time. This century is indeed pitiless, more cruel perhaps than any preceding it. The total volume of cruelty as also its various forms are certainly as large and numerous in this century as in any other, probably bigger. Everything has apparently come to a climax. If injustice and cruelty have multiplied, so have revolts against them. In this lies the specific quality of our century. Well may a solution be reached before this century is out. Revolutions against injustice and inequality may succeed, for they envelop all the earth and are directed against everything ugly and unequal. Cruelty may still take place, for these revolutions are unco-ordinated. Revolutions against one manifestation of injustice in one part of the earth is colliding against another type elsewhere. A growing awareness of the various revolutions may help co-ordinate, not necessarily under a deliberate plan.

We have already considered the procedural revolution of non-violence. There are seven such in all. A main revolution of our times aims at achieving equality between man and woman. Of all

injustices, plaguing the earth, those arising out of the inequality between the sexes are perhaps the bed rock. Inequality between man and woman has so become part of human habit and nature that it seeps into everything else. More often than not, participants in this ferocious game of inequality are not even aware of what they are doing. They revel in it and believe that are engaged in some courtly exercises of courtsey and respect or acts of celestial piety. Most of humanity suffers from one inequality or another, but one half of it is weighted down further. Woman's participation in collective life is exceedingly limited, also in Russia, which boast of having achieved equality between the sexes. Unequal employment practices are a very small expression of woman's inferior position, often insidiously concealed. Bar perhaps climes and ages, when mother law prevailed, man has ever been actuated by two contrary impulses towards woman. He wants his woman to be bright, intelligent, handsome and the rest in short, a very living person. He wants her to be wholly his. Nobody can be bright unless she or he were independent. Nobody can be wholly another's, unless she or he were reduced to the spiritual status of a tree or a dog. In the mind of the male, therefore, resides a grievous clash between wanting her to be his woman, as also alive and beautiful, therefore, to be free and at the same time unfree. Not unless this clash is resolved at least tentatively and pragmatically, can there be equal status for woman. Certain disadvantages of earlier aging and bodily strength apply to woman and the crust of customs centuries old reduces her to the second sex. Giving her equal opportunity would not solve the problem of inequality between the sexes. When a group of people is held down by debility, physical or cultural, the only way to bring it up to equality with others is through conferment of preferential opportunities.

The third solution is aimed against caste. Although caste as a mature institution is confined to India, it is universal as essence and incipient beginning. Caste is immobile class. Loosening caste is class. This slow swing between class and caste has so far been a law of human history. In India alone congealment into caste has taken place; elsewhere it is various degrees of freezing and unfreezing. Caste restricts opportunity. Restricted opportunity constricts ability. Constricted ability further restricts opportunity. Where caste prevails, opportunity and ability are restricted to ever-

narrowing circles of the people. Even this ability narrowing and exclusive, is like incestuous breeding devoid of much value. India's experience is conclusive proof that caste turns a country into the arid deserts of intellectual inadequacy. The intellect probably acquires an unwholesome gift for make-belief and adjustment for deception and a dead kind of brilliance of accustomed phrase, but its originality vanishes.

No other part of the earth has indeed suffered as much from constricted ability and the near death of the nation that flows from caste, but its drawbacks are everywhere to see. Incipient caste is everywhere. So is corresponding restriction of ability and opportunity. The only way out is preferential opportunity for groups whom caste has more or less disabled. Euro-American revolutions flew the banner of equal opportunity. These lands were cursed at worst with an incipient beginning of caste and almost all their populations could make use of equal opportunity. The banner of equal opportunity produced revolutionary consequences. Entire populations were invigorated, with some exceptions as also differences in degree of vigour.

Where ability has become constricted through culture of centuries, equal opportunity can only further widen the gulf. Groups whom centuries have made able, when a cultural selection almost on the lines of natural selection has taken place, are in a position to make near-monopolistic use of equal opportunity. Development in such areas increases inequality, as any one can see who has evaluated India's meagre development under freedom. Like backward regions and depressed areas, there are backward and depressed castes. Everybody has accepted the need for preferential treatment to backward and depressed areas, for favoured investments and services. A similar principle of preferential opportunity for backward groups should be incontestable and as universally acceptable.

Two difficulties come in the way. It is easier to think rationally of regions and areas while thought in relation to groups of men is encumbered by prejudice. Secondly, caste resulting in greater group inequalities and poverty group together. Poverty restricts the mind. Everybody struggles for increasing his or his group's share in the national income. This struggle is indeed universal to man, but where national income grows and only a few are pressed very heavily for the bare needs of life, an expansive

mentality prevails. A restrictive mentality goes with caste and poverty, for everyday primary aim is to secure his own share. A system of preferential opportunities for backward castes is not compatible with a restrictive mentality. So, the vicious circle is there.

The claimant and the powerful classes in a caste-ridden society do not possess an expansive mentality and a scope of preferential opportunity is therefore unpalatable to him. The submerged groups and castes are hardly in a position to lay effective claim to preferential opportunity. To finish this vicious circle of caste and poverty and restrictive mentality, a great revolution of spirit is necessary. Only, if all men are persuaded to see that growing inequality and position go together in the same way as wealth and approximating equality, would this material and spiritual revolution be possible. India needs this revolution more than any other land, but all peoples need it to some degree.

Of the two revolutions that have made the greatest noise in our country and the earlier, one is nationalist and the other social. The nationalist revolution has asked for the freedom of the people, the social revolution that of the individual. People's freedom has perhaps always been the grand passion of man. It certainly is in our time. Nothing energises so much as the concept of country, nation, people the land of the mother or the father. To over-run countries, to conquer peoples, to rule over them or at least to take tribute has been pastime of powerful armies in recorded history. To free all peoples of the earth has been in addition the endeavour of our time. Only a very little is still left to be done for the endeavour to succeed completely. All peoples of the earth, at least the bigger ones, shall be free. Whether the striving for freedom of a smaller people, like the Welsh or the Kurds, who are today part of a larger people, both in some close way related, will acquire significance for history will depend on how two contrary twists of destiny are unravelled, the material trend to larger concentrations and the spiritual urge for smaller groupings.

National freedom is on the way to becoming man's irremovable property. The talk here is of national freedom in the political sense. No people shall now be allowed to exercise direct rule over another. Indirect controls or oppressions may continue and their fate shall be part of the wider fate of the total fight against injustice But direct political rule of one nation over another

belongs to the irrevocable past.

When nations like individuals may not stop losing vigour, it sounds brash to make enduring prophecies about them. Such nations disintegrate and invite control. But, the two great countries of the world are so sensitive of each others' strength that neither will tolerate new and direct expansion of the other. All that is left for them to do is to assist their satellites and others not to crumble. Even if a people might have in natural course disintegrated and invited control, it is not now permitted to do so. It must stand erect If a people starts wobbling, America or Russia slap it into some semblance of holding together. Mankind has stepped into the age when imperialism refuses to exercise direct occupation and prefers to inject a minimal strength into its victim in order that others may not gobble it up.

That is not to say that imperialism of the indirect varieties is disappearing. Hidden imperialisms of various kinds are showing themselves. The most pernicious and root of all else is productivity imperialism. Accidents of history have equipped some peoples with a production apparatus of vastly superior yield. While, for instance, the Indian people must content itself with a per head income of around Rs. 350 a year, some white peoples average over Rs. 10,000. All coloured peoples suffer from a similarly low productivity. Collateral with it is international landlordism, which gives some peoples richer and more extensive lands consequent upon usurpation and conquest. Other hidden imperialisms appear as symptoms or effect like that of weapons, the mind or price-loot. The world shall not be equal or peaceful unless all imperialisms are hunted out of their darkest lairs

Price-loot and mind or skill imperialism pollutes relationships between countries of primary produce and those of manufactures and modern skills. A worse pollution is in evidence within peoples, particularly such as are exceedingly poor. The poorer the country, the greater is the inequality within it. Some measure of inequality is indeed endemic to all peoples. The total national produce of a country is nowhere evenly divided among its population nor is property equally owned. Among the white peoples, however, there is a trend towards apprc .imation of wealth and income. Most wages and incomes are within a ten-fold range, whether in US or USSR. What distinguishes one from the other is the top crust, which owns greater wealth in one case but

in both enjoys fairly similar benefits and privileges. A marvel of white civilization, capitalist or communist, is the extent of economic equality within the great bulk, almost all, of the population. Nevertheless, it is not yet equality, nor anywhere near it. The fight against inequality must be waged for a long time to come, in a sense, for ever.

The fifth revolution of the poor against the rich, the little man against the big, is necessary for all mankind, more so for the coloured peoples. The agricultural labourer in India earns eight annas or one-tenth of a dollar a day, in the US six dollars or rupees thirty; the average income per head is rupee one against rupees thirty, the daily expense of India's Premier amounts to Rs. 25,000 and that of the US President only one-fifth as much; India's parliamentarian obtains in salaries and amenities nearly fifty rupees a day same as his British counterpart. In these broad statistical outlines is hid the story of misery and filth for most of mankind, of general inequality, but of groaning inequality in lands that are filthier and more miserable. Conscience dies in lands where the gulf is so wide that the eye prefers to avert its gaze. Their parliamentary system gets poisoned with privilege and voters are too dumb or listless to make effective use of their vote. Parliaments of the most democratic lands largely amend or beautify; revolutions create the new society in the raw. If the procedural revolution of non-violence should successfully interpenetrate this great revolution of our times, the social and economic, man will learn to live well.

A revolution specific to our time aims at demolishing inequality springing from skin-colour. Aside from material handicaps of productivity or weapon power that belong to coloured skin, the impression prevails that beauty goes with fairness. Not least does this erroneous belief obtain in duskier lands. This downgrading of coloured skin is certainly the result of white supermacy in the past four hundred years, at least in some measure. Political situations intertwine with aesthetic emotions. It would be of some interest to conduct research into aesthetic opinions of different lands in various ages. There was certainly a time in India when "the dark one" was synonymous with a young and handsome damsel same as the fair one is today.

Most of humanity and therefore of womankind is dark. The dark women is in no way less beautiful than the fair one, for what

makes beauty is not the colour of the skin but its texture and figure and features. And yet such misery is caused by wrong notions of beauty. What warping of souls takes place and what seed of tyranny or unfair behaviour sinks deep into the unconscious of hundreds of millions of men and women due to wrong beliefs on skin colour. The female face and figure will perhaps for ever be to the male the greatest thing of beauty as the male's to the female at least in some measure. Its appreciation should not be soured by errors of tradition or prejudice. To dispel such wrong aesthetics is task of our time. Demolition of inequalities arising out of colour must indeed take place in also spheres of life. It must, in the sphere of the aesthetic revolution, test skin not by colour but by texture.

The seventh revolution aims at protecting privacy against encroachment by the collective. The individual has been steadily losing his sovereignty to organization. That is not to say that his importance or welfare have necessarily gone down. They have in fact been going up, more so in those areas where his sovereignty has been suffering. The individual's welfare and happiness, education and health, also his leisure and much of his life and thought are subject to planning of various kinds. This planning is rigorous in lands of communism, but a growing element of organisational compulsion is present everywhere. While examining the revolution to protect privacy, note must be made of this characteristic of our time to plan to do good.

State planning always aims at doing good. Any bad that comes out of it is unwilled and incidental consequence. The source of this bad lies in compulsion. When men are compelled to choose the good in place of the bad, some evil consequences necessarily follow. Not only are there various kinds of good and priorities among them, but what is good or bad is not always so clear as the planners think. Furthermore, taste, discrimination, knowledge and wisdom come better when there is freedom to choose and err. In countries without state planning, organizations for private profit achieve a more or less similar result. With all the vaunted freedom of choice, education, information and entertainment stay within a certain framework of permissibility, also in societies without state planning. In addition, the lower and more monotonous level wins generally. Organisations compel, whether for profit or ideal, although it is no use denying that totalitarian

compulsion is more through-going and insidious.

Organised effort to do good is a mark of our time. Even in extreme capitalist societies, some type of sickness insurance or unemployment relief has become obligatory. State investment in regions and industries which do not attract private capital, is becoming fairly general. Planning to do good may therefore be expected to increase, more so in lands of poverty and scarce capital. With that will increase encroachment on privacy.

Which is private or public is not easy to define. Much depends on the moors of the land or the generation. An atmosphere nevertheless of freedom and privacy is comparatively easy to distinguish from the compulsory and public. What is happening in Soviet Russia at the present moment is important as a trend in this connection. Jazz music and abstract painting are being ridiculed by organization as much as they are sought after in certain private circles. Poets and novelists are demanding the freedom to sing or lament. All these spheres shall some day be included in the private deserving of protection from encroachment by state or organization. A certain loosening of certain rigid notions on property is simultaneously operating.

There lies the essential debate of the white peoples. Democrats among them insist that recognition of the rights of privacy must necessarily permit property and its rewards in some form. No direct connection between property and privacy seems logically to be necessary. In actual practice, communist ownership of property has led to encroachment on privacy on all kinds of relationships from child-bearing to making of speeches. These danger signals, therefore, must always be there. Rights of privacy and freedom must be recognized in all those spheres, which are not directly connected with property. Interconnections in modern living are indeed far too complex to be treated by simple or easy definitions. Rights of privacy in the sphere of house-keeping or entertainment, for instance, may have indirect effects on the institution of property. What is then to be done ? One must be ready to take risks. It should for instance not he permissible to encroach on privacy on the ground that sentiments rather than the institution of property would be encouraged.

Seven revolutions and a good, seven revolts against injustice and public planning to do good, are the healthful sign posts of this century, same as increase in cruelty and poverty is its virulent disease. Whether health will be able to overcome germs of disease

will depend largely on the outcome of the issue between weapons and disarmament. This issue will itself depend on how far and how soon the seven revolts against injustice mature. The curse of monotone may perhaps be laid low.

HIDDEN IMPERIALISMS

I have long held to the notion that the world is divided between the privileged white and the coloured underdog. This notion has sometimes been mistaken for an act of vengeful hostility to the white peoples, which does no good to the world. I have, however, felt emotionally at home with Euro-America and, in fact, found greater awareness of the world among them than among the coloured peoples. The coloured man generally is emotionally hostile to Euro-America and intellectually enslaved to it. Men like me are emotionally friendly to Euro-America, but strive for intellectual freedom from it. Our position has been a little difficult of understanding both for the white and the coloured lackey but the coloured man's angle that we bring to bear upon our interpretation of the world and its events helps reveal the truth. We did not create the division between the privileged white and the coloured underdog. It is there. In acknowledging the division, we aim to destroy it, not to reverse the roles but to achieve equality. One could, therefore, have legitimately expected more of the Chinese Communists than of the Russian Communists, at least in certain spheres. I will first record the spheres of these expectations before trying to discover what has happened to them.

Mankind must know of many insidious but hiterto unknown imperialisms. As imperialism is a somewhat odorous word, it creates a wall on genuine understanding, when it should not. The idea is not to blame anybody. A certain situation of empire-colony relationship has arisen in several spheres of human activity. History, if anybody, must be blamed for it. The coloured peoples must bear the blame for it just as much as the white peoples, if not more, for they were supine, indolent or stupid when the whites were active, masterful and bloody.

Lebensraum imperialism, or international landlordism, is the first of the unapprehended criminals. Countries like the United States and Soviet Russia have enormous space with little density of population. Accidents of history alone have gifted these enormous

land masses. Cruel barbarism has incidentally been a contributory factor to such accidents. Siberia and Australia are peopled at one person to the square mile. Canada is not much different. California is well under ten persons to the square mile. We may contrast these with the densities of 350 persons to the square mile in India and nearly 200 in China. If landlordism within a country can be so unsavoury to the progressive, as it ought to be, what of this international landlordism ? Some day, somebody or perhaps the whole of mankind will have to set right these unjust turns of history.

Mind-imperialism is as much a mark of our times as any other. It is true that there is a willingness on the part of the intellectual imperialist to impart his learning, though not necessarily all the skills or the situation of element awakening, to the colonials of the mind. It may be pointed out that a similar mind-imperialism exists internally in India. Certain castes have become mind-imperialists through long tradition. One might say that several thousand years of division of labour by birth have been acting almost like a natural selection. On the world stage, this has been going on for about 400 years. The white mind-imperialist would be just as wrong as the coloured high-caste, native mind-imperialist, if he were to deny all responsibility for this situation and content himself with the nostrum of equal opportunity. Equality of opportunity can only continue and deepen the injustice of mind-imperialism. Only through unequal and privileged opportunities to colonials of the mind can mind-imperialism be abolished.

A third such hidden tyranny is productivity-imperialism. Everyone knows that Russia and America with roughly one-eighth of the world's population produce more than half of its wealth. The landless labourers in India earns eight annas or ten American cents a day, while his opposite number in the US earn about Rs. 25 or five American dollars a day. Russia and America produce wealth worth between Rs. 8,000 and Rs. 14,000 per person per year, while India has to be content with a partly sum of Rs. 400 per person per year. Russia and America are growing each year at the rate of Rs. 250 per person per year, while the corresponding amount in India is just Rs. 5. The idea is not to apportion blame, at least not in the present. The basis for this productivity-imperialism may be traced to ancient exploitation. If there is exploitation today, it is more or less with the willing consent of those exploited. No imputation of blame or any other kind of accusation must be

read into this. The situation has to be recognised. If we the human race are to one, this situation must be deeply understood and remedied.

Weapons-imperialism is a necessary corollary of the previous imperialisms or perhaps their source, and it is not so hidden. Russia and America have often agreed in their drafts on the need to keep the knowledge and the reality of nuclear weaponry to themselves. Some of the progressive Americans and Russians would be shocked if they were told that this amounts to weapons-imperialism of the white against the coloured. The coloured peoples have indeed no right to fret or fume. They are more than willing to stockpile any old conventional weapons while they pay worshipful homage to the unilateralist disarmer in Euro-America. Such is the split mind of the coloured man. Once again, it is not a question of blame or accusation, but of simple recognition of a situation in which one part of mankind possesses almost the ultimate in weapons.

Price-loot imperialism is the fifth one in this category with which I shall stop the present enumeration. Price movement and the terms of trade are almost always unfavourable to agriculture and the producer of raw materials. If the prices of manufactures have gone up by a hundred per cent in the last ten years, primary produce has increased just by 74 per cent. Robbery on this score alone must be running into billions every year. I dare say that there is a similar internal price-loot in the relationship between manufactures and primary produce. But that is aggravated to a very large extent by the presence of indirect taxation. One hears almost every day of foreign aid and the philanthropic motives involved in it. The taker of gifts must indeed be contrite and humble, at least until the taker has learned not to misuse gifts and both he and the giver have become aware of the world situation as a whole. However, one never bears of the price-loot inherent in every item of international trade between the white and the coloured

Against each of these imperialisms, India and China and all the other coloured peoples should have been able to act with firmness and in unison. They should, of course, have made every effort to include such white peoples in their ranks and, in fact, invite to leadership those willing to recognize the world situation. But none of this was to happen. I had sometimes day-dreamed in my earlier years that China and India and the just-minded whites would be able some day to knock at the doors of Australia, Siberia and

California and have them opened. But, the knocking has taken place elsewhere. Bursting with some kind of power, one knows not which, China has sought the easy way out. She has knocked at the Himalayas. Not to talk of Australia, she did not even knock at Hong Kong or Macao. She did not have strength enough in her knuckles even for measly enterprises. She has chosen to knock where she thought her strength sufficed.

I am compelled to believe that this shall ever remain a tragedy of the human race. Enthroned man will work not for the removal of injustice but for the attainment of aims that lie within his reach. The reach of the coloured man must necessarily remain small, even wicked, for a long time yet. Not much can, therefore, be expected of the coloured man that sits on the throne. Deliverance must come, if it ever will, from the white man. He has infinitely greater power and potentially greater intelligence. If ever he sees the world situation as a whole, he may do something about it. Coloured peoples are indeed not out of the arena altogether. Such of them whom little packets of power do not corrupt may take a wider view and the more risky initiative. I must, however, add an item to the theory of the struggle between the white and coloured peoples. This struggle will be overcome, if at all, by the intelligence of the white as much as by the self-interest and radicalism of the coloured.

I rather turn towards Russia and America. I do not intend to make a very close examination of their respective merits in regard to the five imperialisms. So far, neither has shown much merit or intelligence. Some rough isolated trends may be indicated. The Russians seem to have been more willing to communicate their skills of the steel industry to Indians than the West European has been. They have also charged lower rates of interest on their investment. This would demonstrate their superiority in relation to productivity-imperialism, although in a very small way. Americans, on the other hand, have been willing to take coloured settlers into California, although only nominally. Coloured students at their universities are apparently more numerous than at the Russian universities. How far this is due to the willingness of coloured governments to open their students to Americanism rather than Russianism and how far to the inclination of Russia to emphasise a particular type of general education rather than technical and scientific skills at least for foreign students is more than I can say.

Russian record against open imperialism, of political domination by one people over another, has in recent years been undoubtedly superior to the American.

Would there be a future improvements of achievements in respect of the five imperialisms enumerated here, and who would be better—Russia or America ? I hope and pray that both Russia and America in whose hands, more than any other's, rests the betterment of the human race, will become equally aware of the world situation as a whole.

15

ON INEQUALITY OF SEXES, SINGLE WOMAN AND WIDOW

RAMMANOHAR LOHIA

Dr. Ehrenfels completes his plea for preferential rights for women. Some women may not themselves have liked such a plea because of its assumption that woman is inferior to man in certain spheres. A large number of men must have felt awkward, if for no other reason than that they would, in the new situation, inherit their names from their mother rather than from their father. But this problem of women must not be treated on the level of temporary annoyances; it must be tackled at its root. Woman is undoubtely among the most exploited sections of humanity, together with the poorest and lowliest of men. She may try to forget her condition with love or trinkets and her charitable generosity. But ugly practices of society and certain dark recesses of the soul have both combined to turn woman into a sphere where socialism is most needed. If socialism and democracy are a battle for equality they are cut out specially as creeds of women.

Furthermore, the new mode of this battle for equality comprises of civil disobedience, which alone promises a new civilisation, and man without woman is totally unsuited for this new type of fight. If groups of women in considerable numbers are ever present in the ranks of civil resisters, the possibility of degeneration into street fighting or violence is greatly minimised. Woman is a truer agent of civil resistance than man. She is undoubtedly superior to man in this as in other spheres of

generosity. When a scheme of preferential rights is demanded for her, that is in no way a stigma or a traducing. Rights more than duties belong to the sphere of politics and political action belongs to the sphere of organisation. In the sphere of organisation, man is the superior of woman. An attempt must be made to reduce this superiority in such measure as is possible through a scheme of preferential rights for women. Human ingenuity may be able to propound a scheme other than that outlined by Dr. Ehrenfels.

Dr. Ehrenfels had once given an exceedingly interesting slant on the overwhelming presence of Malayalees in Delhi and its central government. Delhi itself has lots of fun about its disease which it rollickingly calls Menongifts, and Dr. Ehrenfels thinks that Menons, Nairs and Pillais make such underful secretaries to government ministers precisely because they have been brought up in a matrilineal tradition. Men brought up in the matrilineal tradition learn the art of life adjustment with their mother's milk, for they have to adjust their way through the triple authority of the mother, the father and the maternal uncle. This gives them an unexampled capacity for adjustment. Adjustment and creativity are undoubtedly two different capacities and neither should be sacrificed to the other. It is therefore of deciding consequence that the problems of man and woman, of matrilineal and patrilineal society, of adjustment and creativity, of the demand for preferential rights for woman should be deeply studied in order that woman's inequality may be reduced to the minimum and that she may help banish the methods of violence from human pursuits.

The more enduring problems of mankind tend to suffer neglect against these cacophony roused by passing economic or international problems of the agony. But, the problem, for instance, of the single woman of today or of the step-child is certainly more enduring and consequential to mankind than many brothers which are constantly causing controversy. Cruelty is a state of the human mind, as much as it is an expression of certain economic and political relationships. As long as man lives and there is family and marriage, the step-child would be there, perhaps in diminishing numbers, and its soul must be protected against any kind of cruelty. How often is the soul of a step-child of lender years singed by a callous word or a discriminating deed from its parents, these of whom is a substitute and has received later admittance into the family. Similarly, the single woman of today is an

extraordinary person and deserves deeper study and more sympathetic treatment than she has so far received. She is probably no more unhappy than many married women and, if there are some exceedingly happy ones in her ranks, they can be matched by the ranks of the married.

The single woman of today differs from the married women not in the extentment of this or that emotion or quality but in that she has an entirely different status. Her numbers keep on steadily increasing. The single woman need not necessarily be a lonely woman, but her status does deserve to be studied with greatest sympathy and objectivity. The thought of her makes the tender. She may be like a sunless day which is always on the verge of grain or like the moonlight filtering through casuarina leaves or she may alternate between the two states. In either case, her status requires deep study. As long as it is not possible for woman to bathe herself into purity after wading through a mire of dirt, in the style of Flaubert, at will and through payment of a few pieces of a silver, the overwhelming loneliness that occasionally overtakes the single woman of today and the cruelty that an unthinking society metes out to her deserve the attention of sociologists as well as poets.

So also the widow is the recipient of much cruelty in all the world, but she is overwhelmingly so in India. The 1951 census counted a total of 1,34,000 widows out of 61,18,000 females between the ages of five and fourteen. With widowhood goes the stigma, to say the least, of bad luck in all the world, and definitely so in India, where nearly 13 per cent married females are widows. The child widow is like a single woman with the possible difference that she is more of a rainless but cloudy day and less of casuarina moonlight. Widows, not yet old and particularly those who have no male children, become the recipients of special cruelty and, if the single woman is sometimes resignedly disconsolate about life, the widow is, disconsolately resigned. The condition of the widow had, in the past, excited sympathetic attention in the country. In the beginning, there was a furore against widow remarriage. The controversy died out. Social reformers were happy that they had won yet another encounter. But India is a big bog into which everything sinks beyond recognition after having caused a few ripples and eddies.

A recent disclosure made by Mr. Gatubhai Dhruv, of a

Gujarat social reform organisation, showed that over 1,200 widows of Gujarat had delied social barriers and remarried since the widow remarriage legislation was enacted a hundred years ago. That gives an average of ten widows remarried each year. The story is indeed not so bleak, for the backward castes are not so cruel with their widows, as are the high castes, and much happens in the country without any social organisation being involved in it. Nevertheless, a problem of very serious import exists. It goes much beyond widow remarriage and other specified sources of cruelty.

Will the Indian bog ever dry up sufficiently or will persons and parties be able to drive such firm stakes into it as to recover from it some firm ground. Social reformers and revolutionaries who are content with scoring a debating point over conservatives and reactionaries must learn their lesson properly. An endless round of profitless controversy would otherwise go on in relation to every subject of renewal. Every reform occasions a heated controversy in the early stages and then that massive society which is conservative accepts intellectual defeat by allowing a few venturesome persons to go their own way, on the fringes, in respect of widow remarriage or the single woman and similar phenomena, while it is overwhelmingly victorious in that it keeps unaltered the main arena of life.

Cruelty is the greatest source of life's ugliness. Its forms are manifold. It has burrowed itself into the darkest and the innermost recesses of the human mind through hundreds of centuries. It must be patiently ferreted out so as impatiently to be destroyed. "Mankind" hopes to have documents and other contributions on this and similar topics of enduring cruelty.

[*Editorial Comment, Mankind, Vol. I, No. 2, September 1956*]

BEAUTY AND SKIN COLOUR

The colour of the skin is no criterion of beauty or any other type of superiority. And yet the fair of colour and the beautiful are words of similar seaning not alone in the white land of Europe but more so in the sultrier times of Asia or the Americas. On merit, this disortion of aesthetics is explicable.

The dark of colour have not always been treated with neglect, at least not in India. To Sanskrit literature, the dark one, Shyama, is the beautiful one. She need not actually have been dark of colour, but if she was young and beautiful, and the young and the

beautiful often tend to be synonymous, that was called Shyama. The preplexed cloud asks as to how he would recognise the damsel to whom the message was to be delivered and Kalidas describes the Shayma of slender waist and of step langourous with the weight hips, of the lower lip red and full, of eyes that belong to an astonished deer and similar treasure. The male incarnations of godhead, Rama and Krishna, were dark of colcur.

The greatest woman of Indian myth was dark. Draupadi also called Krishnaa has suffered much neglect, probably because current make vanity cannot reconcile itself to her five husbands and a platonic affair or two in addition. Savitri and Seeta, the chaste and also the fair of colour, represent India's humanhood, not entirely without reason, but unreason ensues when other representatives are excluded. Krishnaa, the dark female, and Krishna, the dark male, are however, the two peerless flowers of India's myth-making with the utmost beauty and fragrance.

Draupadi is perhaps the one woman of myth or history in the wide world, who was wiser and wittier than all the men of her time. The question of comparinng her with Krishna should never arise, for this woman of ready left and deep wisdom was his friend, the companion, the heroine and the occasion of his years of duty as Radha was of those of delight, and Krishnaa and Krishna are the two heroes of Mahabharat of equal merit, companions without a shadow of conflict. This Draupadhi was dark of skin.

Are not then the fair of skin beautiful ? To say that they are not would gain be untrue. In fact, one of the finest poems on women's beauty describes the visible forehead surrounded by the darkness of the hair as the imcomplete moon of the 8th day. Such a forehead must necessarily be fair and this exceedingly delicate poem also belongs to Sanskrit literature. Ancient Indian had probably succeeded in separating beauty from colour of complexion and was ready to discover the beautiful wherever it was located. It had presumably at least during certain periods been able to rid itself of prejudices in favour of the dark or of the fair in appraisals of beauty. Succeeding generations have squandered this great maturity of aesthetic judgement.

From such rites of beauty contests as are revealed to the world, it would appear that the measurements of chest, waist and hip are among the deciding qualities. No dark beauty however has

so far been elected. A Japanese Miss Universe succeeded in gate-crashing after what must have been nearly half a century of beauty contests. Japanese women must, of course, have been beautiful even before one of them was crowned as the queen of the world and it is not as though they are more beautiful today than before. The change is not in them but in the eyes of the beauty judges of California. The turn for the dark skins of Africa and Asia may yet come.

The eyes of the beholder have so patently deceived not only over weeks or decades but also over tens of centuries, for they see that the mind has taught them to. Assam is the fabled land of feminine magic and also of feminine charm. Visiting strangers extoll the beauty of its females, most of them because of ceremony and without knowing what they are talking about. Is it the soft melting beauty of the fair skinned which they praise or the celestial shapes of the dark skinned for which their eyes are beholden ? Assam is indeed a land of feamale beauty, but they could hardly know it who confuse beauty with fair skin. The tea woman, or at least some of them, predominently of Chattisgarh and Oriya extraction arrest the eye with the shape of their body and the lustre of their visage and hold it captive for ever and these labouring women are dark-skinned. Not many hit upon this truth or beauty residing in dark well as fair skin ever in their life. Some do, but when their youth has passed. Myth also makes Radha the fair-skinned the companion of the youthful Krishna, while Krishnaa who is dark of skin is his companion in the period of statecraft and middle age. As one grows in years, on begins to prefer the south to the north and also those who are dark of skin.

I am talking from the angle of the male and about female beauty. There is no implication that I hold woman to be a thing of beauty and no more. If that in fact were my perspective, I would never have been able to discern Draupadi's beauty, of which her unexcelled wisdom seems to be a source or that of Assam's tea women, with whom labour, independence and good looks would be difficult to disentangle. If I were a female, I would probably have looked at the question of male beauty much from the same angle. In the first place, the male has not suffered the same amount of depreciation because of the colour of the skin, and, secondly, the female has so far been busy evaluating her own beauty as his. Should beauty ever become a mark of man to the extent that it is today of

woman, which I very much doubt, the proposition about the colour of the skin would hold just as well if not more.

Meenakshi the fish-eyed has her abode in Madura, now the chief city of the river Vygeyi, which at one time nurtured the great Pandyan kingdom. This great goddess who presides all by herself over what must be one of the largest temples of India, is not the only fish-eyed one. All women of the Vygeyi share in her beauty. To judge between the fish-eyed and the deer-eyed would be at all times difficult, for the mediterranean eyes speak just a little bit more to the senses, while those of the Vygeyi speak that bit more to the soul. The fish-eyes seem to possess a little extra of the quality of sympathy and mercy. These Vygeyi women of the fish eyes are dark-skinned, as are most women of Tamilnad, India's true south.

Tamilnad makes its own films in Tamil language, though Hindustani films are also popular. A most curious fact stands out that, though male heroes of these films are generally Tamils, Andhra and Malayali women are just as generally cast in the role of film heroines. There may be many reasons for this, but I would like to mention one. I had occasion to see Tambaram Lalita, a Tamilian woman, play in a minor role, and I looked intently at her for a possible clue to the behaviour of Tamil films. The thick coat of paint and powder made her face look different from her arm, whose true colour showed through a coating that was not as liberal. Lest one should put it down to the failure of technique, it is only fair to wonder whether all parts of a heroine's body which a film has to show can be effectively covered with such thick coats of paint and powder.

I found Lalita just as beautiful as any other woman cast in the major roles of that film. A dark skinned Meenakshi of shapely body would of course be peerless. But, the dark-skinned Tamilians evidently do not think so and they prefer to see the Malayali and Andhra women of lighter skin in their films. A friend completed my observation and told me that, before the beauty judgments of film audiences could come into play, the dark-skinned beauty would have to pass muster at the hands of the producer or the director. The coat of paint and powder may charm the audience, but the producer would be a little too close for that.

This distortion of aesthetic judgment must be ascribed to political influences. The fair-skinned peoples of Europe have

dominated the world for over three centuries. For the most part, they conquered and ruled, but in any event, they have possessed power and prosperity, which the coloured peoples have not. If the Negroes of Africa had ruled the world the world in the manner of the whites of Europe, standards of woman's beauty would undoubtedly have been different. Poets and essayists would have spoken of the soft satin of the Negro skin and its ennobling feel and sight; their aesthetic constructions of the beautiful lip or elegant nose would have tended to be on the side of fullness Politics influence aesthetics; power also looks beautiful, particularly unequalled power.

The worldwide conjunction of fair skin with overwhelming power has received great reinforcement from a specific Indian situation. Those fair of skin or at least less dark have generally belonged to the higher caste. The Hindustani word for caste is 'Varna', which probably means colour. The 'Rigveda' has named white as the Aryan colour. Against the background of bright colours of nature and sky in India, the fully white but unstarched raimen probably makes the beholding eye happy and accentuates the beauty of the wearer. But that has nothing to do with the colour of the skin. Nevertheless, the conjunction of worldwide domination with the speciality of India's castes has given to fair skin its formidable prestige and made it a thing of beauty in itself almost without other accompaniments.

Is the colour of the skin then no part of beauty ? When the element of novelty tickles the beholder, all fair skin looks like soothing marbale and, I guess, by the same token, all dark skin, ochre or wheat-like, looks like the immaculate trunk of the plantain tree. After the novelty has passed, the blotches of the white will show themselves same as the monotone of the dark. The colour of the skin is certainly no criterion of beauty. If any quality of the skin goes into beauty, that certainly is its texture, a soft, unbroken and even texture, that is sometimes seen perhaps at its best in China or among the ochre or wheat—like women of Africa, India and similar lands. I have perhaps tilted the balance somewhat in the other direction, and that often happens when an earlies tilt is being corrected. A soft, unbroked and even texture may be found, though more rarely, among the fairer skin, which may cause madness to rage in the blood just as much as its darker skin.

While it makes no sense to prefer between the dark and the fair, some subjective impressions may be noted. All women are beautiful. Some are more so than the others Among the more beautiful ones of fair skin are such as ooze frankness and innocence and pleasing beauty like the clear rippling brook or better still the transparent depths of rivers in the hills and the moon. Among the beautiful ones of dark skin are such as evoke the mystery of life and creation, the quickening that gives to fish its eyes, to the she-elephant its langourous step, to twilight its pregnant repose and all such things where deep calls unto deep.

Beauty and sexuality are allies. Darker women have in fact attracted the sexuality of the dominant male, but only in night clubs or on the sly. India's system of castes erects further hurdles. Not only are the ways of life and speech and conduct different, but the modes dictate a segregation, at least outward, between the sexes of the higher and the lower castes. The dark-skinned women of the lower castes, when genuinely in love, would perhaps neither relish nor be able to practise the ruses of the higher castes. There is however, no love without sexuality and no beauty without love. The woman who loves and is loved radiates the beauty of the starlit sky, whether she is dark or fair. The darker women have in the recent past been denied such love, at least by those who speak or sing of beauty. Hurdles made out of different ways of life and erected among India's castes or between the dark and the fair in all the world may take time to remove. The greatest hurdle of them all is built upon a sheer error, which attributes beauty to fair skin.

The tyranny of colour is among the great oppressions of the world. All women are oppressed and mankind is the poorer for lack of adequate expression to their talents or gifts. Coloured women, who are more numerous, suffer greater oppression. They are reared on a diet of anxiety and inferiority. Even as a little child, the dark girl, who may be sister to a fairer girl in the same family, has to accustom herself to neglect and treatment reserved for citizens of the second grade. The female child suffers lack of opportunities for growth in camparison to the male child, and, on top of that, the coloured girl experiences an additional portion of shame, or at least the burdens of an inferior position. The coloured male is also not wholly free of such burdens.

Soaps and creams and lotions and the latest is injections, as

might change the skin to a lighter hue, are very much in demand by the coloured youth, both male and female. In lands, where a minority of whites and a mass of coloured peoples live together, as in South America, and where the white dominates, the accepted tyranny of colour can be seen in ite most accentuated forms. All the world suffers this tyranny of skin's colour, a tyranny made worse because the tyrants do not practise it as much as the slaves, who inflict upon themselves.

Most tyrannies are built upon error and so is this largest and widest tyranny, that of colour. How coloured humanity has come to willing and eager acceptance of standards of beauty laid down by those of fair skin is probably a greater marvel than any. The key to the marvel is the same as in the case of the tyranny of the rich over the poor, the high caste over the low caste, the foreign-tongued over the native-tongued, the select over the mass. Between dark and fair as between rich and poor lie myriad gradations. The dark can be the black of coal or the yellow of pearl with many intermediate wheats add browns and ochres and chocolates, so that the fair who dominate aesthetic judgments are able to win substantial followers in the dark-skinned camp. The distance between dark and fair as between rich and poor is covered by innumerable intermediate points, so that the restoration of a valid aesthetic judgment has become as difficult as that of a proper economic or moral standard. When would the beautiful women of dark skin assert their supremacy or at least their rights of equality or, perhaps, the revolution in this as in other matters will be paved by the tyrants themselves ? An aesthetic revolution in the evaluation of beauty and its relation to the colour of the skin will blow the air of freedom and inner peace over all the world almost as much as political or economic revolutions.

16

HINDU VERSUS HINDU

RAMMANOHAR LOHIA

The greatest war of Indian history, the war between the liberal and the fanatical in Hinduism, has raged for 5000 years and more and its end is not yet in sight. No attempt has been made, as it should have been, to make of this war the loom on which India's history could be woven. Even incidental mention of rare and, sketchy in books of history. And yet it is the continuing motive force that moves in the country.

All religions have in the course of their career suffered from a conflict between the liberal and the fanatical. But with the exception of Hinduism, that split up and have often drawn blood and, after a long or short period of slaughter, succeeded in overcoming the *conflict*. With Hindusim, a perpetual war between the liberal and fanatical goes on and while open slaughter has not taken place, the conflict remains unsolved to this day and a haze covers the issues involved.

Christianity, Islam and Buddhism have all had their schisms. The fanatical elements that the Catholic faith had at one time accumulated to what was then the liberal challenge of Protestant Christianity. But nobody knows that the Reformation led to the Counter reformation. Catholicim and Protestantism still differ in many of their doctrines that would be hard to call one liberal and the other fanatical. If Christianity stays split on doctrinal and organizational issues, the Shia-Sunni sects in Islam relates to a detail of chronology. Buddhism likewise split into two

sects of Heenayana and Mahayana and, although they never drew away from each other, their differences relate to doctrine and have nothing to with the ordering of society.

Hinduism has known no such split. It has indeed continually disintegrated into sects. The innovating sect has as often come back to it as an tactional unit. Doctrinal issues have therefore never been sharply defined and the conflicts have stayed unresolved. While Hinduism is as prolific as Protestantism in giving birth to sects, it casts over them all an undefinable mantle of unity such as is secured by the Catholic organisation through the prohibition of sects. Hinduism has thus become a system of expanding exploration as much as it is the hunting ground of the irrational and the fanatical.

Before an attempt could be made to discover why Hinduism has so far been unable to work this conflict between the fanatical and the liberal out of its system, it is necessary to recall the broad differences of view that have always prevailed. On four major and concrete issues, those of caste, woman, property and tolerance, Hinduism has suffered from a perpetual swing between the liberal and fanatical attitudes.

Over four thousand years ago and more, molten lead was poured into the ears of some Hindus and their tongues pulled out by other Hindus, for the caste system ordained that no untouchable shall hear or read Vedas. Over three hundred years ago Shivaji had to agree that his dynasty shall ever choose its ministers from among the Brahmins in order to be crowned king according to the Hindu custom. Around two hundred years ago when the last battle of Panipat was fought, and the crown of India passed into British hands as a consequence, one Hindu general quarelled with another for he wanted to pitch his tent on higher land corresponding to his caste. Nearly fifteen years ago a zealous Hindu wished to save Hinduism by throwing a bomb at Mahatma Gandhi, for he had then set out to destroy untouchability. Until recently, and in certain areas to this day, the Hindu barber would not have an untouchable Hindu, while he would be only too willing to serve the non-Hindu.

At the same time, two formidable revolts seem to have taken place against the caste system in ancient times. A whole Upanishad is devoted to the complete and entire demolition of the caste

system. From the nature, tone and compass of attacks made on the caste system in ancient Indian literature, these appear to belong to two different periods—a period of criticism and another of condemnation. While this question may be left to future investigations, it is obvious that the two bright periods of the Maurayas and the Guptas follow upon a comprehensive attack on the caste system. But caste never quite die out. It is at times severely rigid while it loosens during other periods. The fanatical and the liberal continue intertwined in respect of the caste system and the difference between any two periods of Hindu history consists in the dominance of one or the other strand. At the moment, the liberal is dominant and the fanatical dare not become vocal. But, the fanatical is seeking to present itself by entering into liberal thought. If it is too late in the day to talk of by birth, people are talking of caste by vocation. Even if men will not argue for the caste system they rarely act against it, and a climate grows in which the reasoning mind and the habitual mind of the Hindu are in conflict. Caste may slacken as an institution in some of its forms, but as a habit of mind it has not yet been dislodged. The conflict between the liberal and fanatical in Hinduism in respect of the caste system threatens to continue unresolved.

While modern fiction has made us aware of the woman alone knowing who the father of the child is, Jabala, 3000 years ago or more, was not herself sure who the father of her child was and her name is remembered with pride as a truthful woman in ancient literature. In parenthesis it may be remarked that the easte system swallowed her up by turning her son into a Brahmin. Literature of the liberal period has warned us against too close an enquiry into geneologies of families, for like the sources of rivers they too are muddy. Rape under coercion which could not be fought successfully brings the woman no harm nor dirt, for, as this literature says, she renews herself every month. The woman has also the right to divorce and property. While this liberal attitude towards woman prevails in the luminous periods of Hinduism, fanatical periods reduce her to a bit of property to be taken care of by the father, the husband or the son.

At the moment of Hindu woman finds herself in a strange situation both liberal and fanatical. She finds it easier than anywhere else in the world to rise to positions of eminence. But

her claim to a single standard with men in respect of marriage and property continues to be assailed. I have read fanciful leaflets denying the claim of Hindu woman to property on the plea that she might fall in love with a man of another faith and so change her own, as if this could not happen perhaps even more frequently to a Hindu man. That land should not be further fragmented is quite another question and applies both to male and female inheritors, and some way should be found to keep a holding under the permissible maximum intact. As long as law or custom and habits of thinking discriminate between man and woman with respect to property and marriage, the fanatical in Hinduism will not quite die out. The hankering of the Hindu to see in his woman a goddess who never descends from her pedestal opens the most liberal among them to dull and dubious wishes. The fanatical and the liberal shall remain intertwined as long as the Hindu refuses to accept is woman as a human being same as he.

The sense of property in Hinduism is liberalised by its faith in non-accumulation and non-attachment. Fanatical Hinduism, however, so interprets the theory Karma as to give the men of wealth and birth or power a superior status and to sanction as right whatever exists. The question of property in its present form of private versus social ownership is a recent one. But in its old form of non-attachment versus sanctioned order, it has continually been present in the Hindu mind. As with the other issues, the Hindu has never been able to carry his thinking on the question of property and power to its logical conclusion. Hinduism has varied both in time and with the individual only insofar as the one or the other concept of property holds primacy.

Tolerance is commonly reputed to be an unfailing feature of Hinduism. That is not so except in the sense that open slaughter has hitherto been abhorrent to it. The fanatical in Hinduism has always tried to establish unity through uniformity, through the suppression of sects and faiths other than the one that was seeking to dominate, but such attempts have never achieved success. These have in the past been treated more or less like the antics of little children, for Hinduism until recently was called upon to apply the principle of unity in diversity only to its own sects The element of tolerance in Hinduism has therefore been almost always stronger than the element of coercion. But this tolerance must be

distinguished from a similar attitude of mind which European rationalism has brought into the world. Voltaire knew his opponent to be wrong and yet he was willing to fight the battle for tolerance, for his opponent's right to say what he wanted. Hinduism on the other hand, bases in case for tolerance on various possibilities of what is right. It concedes that doctrines and usages may vary with climes and classes and is not prepared to arbitrate among them. It wishes for no uniform pattern in the conduct of men's lives, not even a voluntary uniformity and what it wishes for is that undefinable unity in diversity which it has in the past so successfully threaded through all its sects. Its quality of tolerance therefore rises out of the creed of non-interference, out of the belief that variations need not necessarily be wrong, but are perhaps different expressions of what is right.

Fanaticism has often tried to impose the unity of uniformity on Hinduism. Its motives have always been suspect. Its driving power may well at times has been the desire for stability and strength, but the consequence of its acts have always been disastrous. I do not know of a single period of Indian history when fanatical Hindu was able to give India unity or well-being. Whenever India has been united and prosperous, the liberal in Hinduism in respect of caste, woman, property and tolerance has always predominated. The upswing of fanatical fervour in Hinduism has always led to the social and political break-up of the country, to the disintegration of the Indian people as a State and as a community. I do not know if all those periods when India got broken up into numerous states and kingdoms were characterised by fanatical zeal, but it is undisputable that the unity of the country took place only when liberal Hinduism held sway over the Hindu mind.

Some great failures of modern history to integrate the country stand out. What started as the liberal faith of Gyaneshwar reached its climax in Sivaji and Bajirao but fell just a little short of ultimate success by degenerating in the Peshwa fanaticism. Again, what started as the liberal faith of Guru Nanak reached its climax in Ranjit Singh but degenerated early into the fanatical squabbles of the Sikh confederacy. These efforts that once failed have also sought bitterly to repeat themselves in contemporary times, for some deep and dark stirrings of the soul connect them with the fanatical streams now flowing out from sources in

Maharashtra and Punjab. To a student of Indian history, all this is rich material for study from various angles such as the close connexion between the teacher of the religious world and the political effort to build an Indian union or the problems of where the seeds of degeneracy lie, whether right at the beginning or as the result of a later-mix-up and of the drive that impels groups to repeat their fanatical failures. A similar study of the Vizianagaram effort and whether it had its roots in Shankar or Nimbarak and what rotten seed lay beneath the glory that Humphi once attained would be of great insterest and benefit. Again, what lay at the source of the liberal efforts of Shershah and Akbar and why did they lose to the fanaticism of an Aurangzeb ?

The recentmost effort of the Indian people and Mahatma Gandhi to integrate the country has succeeded, but only partially. Undoubtedly, all the liberal streams of five thousand years and more have pushed forward this effort, but what lies at its immediate source, whether Tulsi or Kabir and Chaitanya and the great line of the Sants or the more modern religious politicians like Rammohan Roy and the Rebel Maulvi of Faizabad, apart, of course, from the liberalising influneces of Europe. Again, all the fanatical streams of the past five thousand years seem to be combining to deluge this effort and, should fanaticism meet its defeat, it will not rise again.

The liberal alone can unite the country. India is too ancient and vast country. No force can unite it except the voluntary human will. Fanatical Hinduism cannot by its nature mould such a will, while liberal Hinduism can, as it has often done in the past. Hinduism of course is not a political religion in the narrow sense, a religion of doctrines or organisation. But, it has been the eminent medium and inspiration for the great impulsion of the Indian political history towards the unity of the country. The great war between liberal and fanatical Hinduism may well be called a conflict between the two processes of unification and disintegration of the country.

Liberal Hinduism has however been unable to solve the problem completely. Within the principle of unity in diversity lies concealed the seed of sway and disintegration. Not to talk of the fanatical elements which always sneak into the most liberal of Hindu concepts and which always hinder the achievement of intellectual clarity, the principle of unity in diverity gives rise to

a mind which is both rich and lethargic. It is tiresome to watch Hinduism continually splitting into sects, each with its own jarring noises, and, however much liberal Hinduism may seek to cover them with the mantle of unity, they inevitably produce a weakness in corporate living of the state. An amazing nonchalance comes to prevail. No one worries about the continual splitting as if everyone is sure that they are parts of one another. This is what gives fanatical Hinduism its chance and driving power, the desire for strength, although the result of its endeavour produces further weakening.

The great war between liberal and fanatical Hinduism has at present taken the outward form of their differing attitudes to Muslims. Nevertheless, let it not be forgotton even for a moment that this is only an outward form and all the old unresolved conflicts continue and are potentially more deciding The assassination of Mahatma Gandhi was not so much an episode of the Hindu-Muslim fight as of the war between the liberal and the fanatical in Hinduism. Never had a Hindu delivered greater blows on fanaticism in respect of caste, woman, property or tolerance. All the bitterness was accumulating. Once before an attempt had been made on Gandhiji's life. It was then obviously and openly for the purpose of saving Hinduism in the sense of saving caste. The last and successful attempt was outwardly made for the purpose of saving Hinduism in the sense of protecting it from Muslim engulfment, but no student of Hindu history can be in doubt that it was the greatest and the most heinous gamble that retreating fanaticism risked in its war of liberal Hinduism. Gandhiji's murderer was the fanatical element that always lies embedded in the Hindu mind, sometimes quiescent and sometimes pronounced, in some Hindus dominant and in others passive. When pages of history shall try the murder of Mahatma Gandhi as an episode in the war between the fanatical and the liberal in Hinduism and arraign all those whom Gandhiji's act against caste and for woman, against property and for tolerance had emaged, the composure and nonchalance of Hinduism may well be shattered.

Why the liberal and fanatical have continued intertwined in the Hindu faith and have never hitherto challenged each other to a clean and decision battles as a subject rich in exploration to students of Indian history. That the complete cleansing of the Hindu mind

in respect of the fanatical never too place is beyond doubt. The disastrous consequences of this unresolved conflicts are also beyond doubt. As long as caste is not completely erased from the Hindu mind or woman treated as an equal being with man, or properly disassociated from the concept of order, the fanatical will from time to time play having with Indian history and also impart it a continuing lethargy. Unlike other religions, Hinduism is not a faith of doctrines and the church but a way of social organisation and that is why the war between liberalism and fanaticism has never been fought out to its end and the Brahmin-Bania combination has ruled India for good or evil through centuries, a rule alternating between the liberal and the fanatical.

Mere liberalisation of the four issues will not do; they have to be once for all resolved of the conflict and eliminated completely from the Hindu mind.

Back of all these unresolved conflicts is the metaphysical problem of the relationship between appearance and reality. There is indeed little difference in the attitudes of liberal and fanatical Hinduism with regard to this problem. Hinduism by and large seeks to go beyond appearance in search of the reality, does not indeed decry phenomenon as false, but only of a lower order to be submerged in minds ascent to the higher reality. All philosophy in all lands have indeed concerned itself with this problem. What distinguishes Hinduism from other faiths and theologies is that, while this problem has been largely confined to philosophy in other lands, it has in India seeped into the faith of the mass of the people. Philosophy has been set to tunes of music and turned into faith. But in other lands, the philosopher has generally denied appearance in search of reality. His effect on the modern world has therefore been very limited. The scientific and secular spirit has hungrily collected all data of appearance, shifted them, tabulated them and discovered laws that hold them together. This has given the modern man, his type being pre-eminently the European, a habit of life and thinking. He accepts ardently facts as they appear. The ethical content of Christianity has furthermore lent to the good acts of man the status of the works of God. All this works towards a scientific and ethical exploitation of the facts of life. Hinduism however has never been able to get rid of its metaphysical basis. Even the common faith of the people goes beyond the visible and sensible for a glimpse of that reality which

appears not. The middle ages in Europe had also shared such a perspective, but let me repeat, this was confined to the philosopher and denied appearance altogether or took it as a reduction of truth, while the mass of the people accept Christianity as an ethical faith and to that extent accepted appearance. Hinduism has never denied facts of life altogether, but only concedes them the status of events of lower order and has always, so to this day, tried to go in search of reality of the higher order. This is the common faith of the people.

A vivid illustration comes to my mind. On the great but half destroyed temple of Konarak, one can see thousands upon thousands of sculptured images carved on the stones of the building There is no miserliness nor covertness in the artist's acceptance of appearance; he has indeed accepted in all these rich variety. Even here there seems to be a certain order of arrangements. From the lowest to the highest block, the sculptured images run in the series of unassorted variety to that of the hunt, to the love play, in music, then to power. Everything is rich movement and activity. But, inside the temple is almost bare and such images as there are speak of stillness and peace. From a moving and active exterior to a still and static interior seems to have been the basic design of this temple. The search for the ultimate reality was never abandoned.

The comparative development of architecture and sculpture as compared to painting might well have its own story to tell. In fact, such painting as are still available to us from ancient times are more architectural than otherwise. Man has probably greater scope to project his notions of ultimate reality into architecture and sculpture than painting.

The Hindu has therefore acquired a split personality. At his best, a Hindu accepts appearance without losing insight into the ultimate and overstriving to enrich his insight, at his worst, his hypocrisy is matchless. The Hindu is probably the world's greatest, hypocrite, for he not only deceives others as hypocrites all the world over do, but he also deceives himself for his own disadvantage. His split mind between appearance and reality often encourages him to do so. What an amazing spectacle has Hinduism presented in the past and does so today ! Hinduism has given its votaries, the commonest among them, the faith of metaphysical equality or oneness between man and things, such as has never fallen to the

lot of man elsewhere. Alongside of this faith in metaphysical quality goes the most heinous conduct of social inequality. I have often wondered if this metaphysical Hindu, when he is well placed, does not treat the poor and low caste as animals and animals as stone and everyone as everything else. Vegetarianism and non-violence obviously degenerate into concealed cruelty. While it can be said of all human endeavour hitherto that truth at some stage turns into cruelty and beauty into profligacy this is perhaps more so true of Hinduism which has attained scales of truth and beauty unsurpassed in other lands, but which has also descended into pits of darkness unplumbed by man else-where. Not until the Hindu learns to accept the facts of life in the scientific and secular spirit, facts relating to work and machine and output and family and growth of population and hunger and tyranny and the like, is there any hope for him to overcome his split personality or to deal a death-blow to fanaticism which has so often been his undoing in the past.

This is not to say that Hinduism must give up its emotive basis and the search for oneness of all life and things. That is perhaps its greatest quality. The awareness and universalising of that sudden onrush of feeling, which makes a village boy pick up the kid of the goat and clasp it as if it were his life, when the automobile speeds along or which sees the tree with its gnarled roots and green branches as part of oneself, is perhaps a quality common to all faiths, but nowhere has it acquired a deep and abiding emotion as in Hinduism. The God of Reason is completely without the God of Mercy. I do not know whether God exists or does not, but this I know that the feeling that makes one kin of all life and things exist although as a rare emotion yet. To make of this feeling a background for all activity even of strife is perhaps an unrealisable adventure. But Europe is dying of strife born out of a too one-sided acceptance of appearance and India is dying of stagnation resulting from an equally one-sided acceptance of the reality behind things. I have no doubt that I would prefer to die of strife than of stagnation. But are these the only two courses of thinking and conduct open to man? It is not possible to adjust the scientific spirit of enquiry with the emotive spirit of oneness without subordinating the one to the other and in full equality as two processes of like merit. The scientific spirit will work against caste and for woman, against property and

for tolerance and of course yield the processes of producing wealth such as will dispel hunger and want. The creative spirit of oneness may secure that ballast without which men's highest endeavour turns into greed and envy and hatred.

It is difficult to say whether Hinduism is capable of acquiring this new mind and to achieving adjustment of the scientific and the emotive spirit. But then what exactly is Hinduism ? To this there is no one answer, but a series of answers. This much is certain that Hinduism is no precise doctrine nor organization nor can any one article of faith or conduct be considered indispensable for Hinduism. There is a whole world of memories and mythology, of philosophy and customs and practices, part of which grossly evil and another which can be of service to man. The whole of it makes the Hindu mind, an essential quality of which some scholars have seen in the principle of tolerance or of unity in diversity. We have seen in the limitations of this principle and where it needs in be revised so as to dispel mental intertia. A common error however in the understanding of this principle consists in the belief that liberal Hinduism has always been open to good ideas and influences no matter where they came from, while fanatical Hinduism is not. This is to my mind an illiterate belief I have not come across in pages of Indian History any period when the free Hindu searched for ideas and objects in foreign lands or was willing to accept them. In all the long connection between India and China, I have only been able to list five fancy articles including vermillion imported into India, and of imports of ideas there is nothing at all.

Free India had essentially a one way traffic with the outside world, not import of ideas and very little of objects, except silver and the like, unless where communities of foreigners settled in India and tried to become a Hindu sector caste with the passage of time. On the other hand, enslaved India and with it Hinduism have shown a remarkable alacrity to ape the conqueror, his language, his habits and ways of living. Self-sufficiency of mind in freedom is matched with its total supineness under slavery. This weakness of Hinduism has never been recognised and it is unfortunate that liberal Hindus in their illiteracy are spreading contrary ideas for propagandist purposes. In the state of freedom, the Hindu mind is indeed open, but only to events taking place within India's frontiers, but remains closed and to ideas and influences

from outside. This it one of its major weaknesses and a reason for India to fall a prey to foreign rule. The Hindu mind must now become open not only to what happens in India, but also to the outside world and it must apply its principle of unity in diversity to all the achievements of human thinking and practice. Strenuous effort must be made to rid it of its habit to alternate between outright indifference to and unco-ordinated acceptance of foreign thought.

The war between the liberal and the fanatical in Hinduism has today taken the surface expression of the Hindu-Muslim conflict, but no Hindu who it aware of the history of his faith and country will fail to take equal notice of the other unresolved conflicts raging for 5000 years and more. No Hindu can be genuinely tolerant to Muslim unless he acts at the same time actively against caste and property and for woman. Likewise, a Hindu who is genuinely against caste and property and for woman will inevitably be tolerant to Muslims. The war between liberal and fanatical Hinduism has reached its most complex stage and it may well be that its end is insight. Fanatical Hindus, no matter what their motives are, must break up the Indian State should they ever succeed, not only from the Hindu-Muslim point of view, but also from that of caste and provinces. Liberal Hindus alone can sustain this state. This war of five thousand years or more has therefore entered a stage in which the very existence of the Indian people as a political community and a State depend upon the victory of the liberal over the fanatical in Hinduism.

The religious and the human problem is today eminently a political problem. The Hindu is faced with the serious choice of accomplishing a complete mental revolution or else of going under. He must be Muslim and Christian and feel like one. I am not talking of Hindu-Muslim unity for that is a political, institutional or at best a cultural problem. I am talking of the emotional identification of the Hindu with the Muslim or the Christian, not in religious faith and practices, but in the feeling that I am he. Such an emotional justification may appear difficult to achieve for often it may have to be one consided and bear the pain of murder and slaughter. I may here recall the American Civil War in which brother killed brother for four years and six hundred thousand died, but Abraham Lincoln and the American people crowned their hour of victory with precisely such an

emotion between the Northern and for southern brother. No matter that the future has in store for India, the Hındu must turn himself inside out to achieve this emotional oneness, with the Muslims. The Hindu faith of emotive oneness of all life and things is also the political necessity of the Indian State that Hindu shall feel one with the Muslim. On the path may yet lie setbacks and defeats, but the direction that the Hindu mind should take is clear.

It may be suggested that the best way to put an end to this war between liberal and fanatical Hinduism is to combat religion. That may indeed be so, but the process is tardy and where is the guarantee that the clever old rogue might not swallow up the anti-religious as one of its numerous sects ? Furthermore the fanatical elements in Hinduism obtain their systematic supporters, when they do, from the semi-educated and from the townsmen, while the illiterate village-folk, however much they might get excited for the moment, cannot be it is steady base. The long wisdom of centuries makes the village-folks as much of the educated, tolerant. In their search for sustenance from anti-democratic doctrines like communism and fascism that base themselves on somewhat similar concepts of caste and leadership, fanatical elements in Hinduism may as well as same the anti-religious garb. The time has come when the Hindu must bathe his mind and cleanse it of the dirt that centuries have accumulated. He must indeed establish an honest and fruitful relationship between the facts of life and the awareness of ultimate reality. Only on this base will he be able to crush for even the fanatical elements in Hinduism in respect of caste, woman, property and existance, which have so long vitiated his faith and disintegrated his country's history. In the days of retreat the fanatical has of sneaked into the liberal Hinduism. Let that not happen again. The issues are clear and sharply defined. Compromise will once again repeat the errors of the past This war must now be brought to a close. A new endeavour of the Indian mind will then start which shall combine the rational with the emotive, which shall make of unity in diversity not an inert but a vital doctrine which shall accept the clean joy of the sensible world without losing insight into the oneness for all life and things.

17

A PHILOSOPHY OF DESPAIR*

RAMMANOHAR LOHIA

I have in mind three kinds of despair : National despair, International despair, and Human despair. Let us first talk about National despair. There has been no revolt in India against any internal regime, however tyrannical, for the last 1500 years. By revolt I mean a movement in which thousands of people are involved. This has led the Indian people to always opt for stability. Not only that it has also killed our desire to take risk—if you do not take risk you cannot bring about revolution—I feel that revolution is almost impossible in our country, because our people are half-fed, half-dead and yet they are satisfied. In other countries of the world wherever there is poverty, there is dissatisfaction. In our country there might be some amount of jealousy but there is no discontent.

One of the main reasons for this state of affairs has been the caste system. This institution of caste is peculiar to our country. Added to it is our slavish mentality. In other countries inequality is maintained by force, and so the people revolt, the moment they feel that they can do it successfully. But in our country, apart from force, caste system helps in maintaining the *status quo*. In Europe you can easily find people who are disgusted with their system. But in one country, it is rare to find such a man. Some people have argued that in India revolution will never take place

because people have accepted inequality as a way of life. This remoteness of the possibilities of revolution in India is my despair on the national plane.

In this context I may draw your attention to the fact that for every people there are different periods of rise and fall. A period might be marked by a desire to do something, to take risk and to move forward. It might be followed by another period when the primary stress is luxurious consumption. Maybe, for the Indian people the period preceding independence was the period when the people were prepared to take risk. I am not saying that that period was one of revolution and renunciation but is cannot be denied that there was a will to suffer. It was quite natural that with independence Indian people entered into the phase of luxurious consumption and today the entire ruling class of India is engaged in conspicuous consumption. At this stage is might be necessary to define the ruling class of India. In every country there is periodic change of ruling class. Any student of history can easily substantiate this point by giving illustrations from European or even Asian history. But in our country there has been no change of ruling class for the last 1500 years. By ruling class I do not mean only the people who actually ruled but also the people who constitute the power elite. This ruling class of India fought with the foreign invaders but when it was defeated it compromised with them. Thus, there is some sort of a synthesis between the way of life of the Indian ruling class and that of the foreign invaders. It is necessary to stress that the second grade ruling elite of India never changes. The actual ruler might change, for instance Pathans were replaced by Mughals, Mughals by Marathas and Marathas by the British. But this ancestrally slave section of the ruling class has always remained so. Who constitute this section might be difficult to define. Broadly speaking it might be said that all those people whose income is above Rs. 1,000 and who use the feudal language, whether Persian or English, belong to this group. In my assessment around 50 lakhs people belong to this and there has been no change of this class. They compromised with every aggressor and they bowed down before every crisis. Even in revolutionary politics the leadership comes from this section of the population because they alone are in a position to grasp and execute new ideas. They take to new ideas but they always see to it that they perpetuate their hold over the

people. Today the top leadership of all political parties comes from this group. They might get followers or flatterers from other sections of the society but there is no denying the fact that they are in full control of the situation. The real tragedy is that other sections of the people have no will to revolt. It is really a peculiar situation—that those who need revolution have no will or strength for it and those who have strength have no need for it. And that explains my despair on the national plane. Added to this are other factors like today an average Indian is a liar, over much talkative, shirks work and is lazy. I have no doubt that we Indians today are the greatest liars and the lazies lot on earth.

This brings me to my despair on the international plane. Two types of despair is gripping me on the international plane: (i) armament and war and (ii) machine. Today the white people are the rulers of the world. They have all kinds of machines and that explains the phenomenal growth of their economy. They are not more intelligent except in inventing new machines. Their system is like that in which about 50 thousand boys and girls take up training in science, engineering and research. Later on when they go into jobs they are asked to find out ways for maximizing production and minimizing cost of production. They do not produce anything except concentrating on research. Some people have the feeling that if the economies of white people continue to develop at this phenomenal rate the time is not distant when there will be no need for buying and selling things. This is a brighter aspect of the situation. But what despairs me is that increase in production kills diversity of life. There is always some ray of uniformity in music, dance, dresses and even faces of people. It is this uniformity which leads to monotony in the white world. At first signal there is no doubt that white people are good in look at, particuiarly their women. When you look at the face of a white woman you might by infatuated and you might even feel that you are having a sort of dream. But if you continue to see them you might feel disgusted because in the process of becoming sweeter they are losing the saltiness of their personality. A French scholar has come to the conclusion that we cannot say the world because it is going to be engulfed by the widespread feeling of meaninglessness.

Without going into the details of armament I simply say that today mankind is spending Rs. 8,000 crores on armaments. There

is another aspect of the problem. Before 1945 weapons were decisive for victory or defeat though then was a lot of condemnation on moral ground. But today weapons are not only bad from the viewpoint of morality but they are becoming useless and redundant because they do not lead either to victory or to defeat. I wonder hot long man will continue collecting the redundant weapon. That is way I feel that in coming 21 years either mankind will do away with weapon or the weapons will exterminate mankind I have painted both the bright and the dark aspects of the situation. But if you stretch the argument, you will easily realise that what is have said about nuclear weapon is equally applicable to conventional weapons. For a moment let us assume that both the USA and the USSR decide to do away with nuclear weapons but nuclear expertise remains with them and so at any moment they can decide to resume production of nuclear weapons. That is why, to my mind, it is high time that mankind do away with conventional weapons too. But now ? We are not living in a world where their is no need of guns. In Europe the police is give a very small stick and not the 'lathi' used by police in India.

One actually reaches at one's wit's and when one thinks of ways and means of total disarmament. Will mankind ever usher in an era when there is no treachery or anger ? I doubt. But this is not the main reason, because 99 per cent of the population can be brought about to a situation where there is no need of weapons.

If a society upto reaches the stage of possible equality, if not total equality, a stage might be reached for doing away with the weapons. If you look at the world everywhere there is a fight against inequality and that makes me hopeful. Perhaps this fight against injustice and inequality is the chief characteristic of 20th century. At least on theoretical plane it seems quite possible that by the turn of the century manking will reach the stage where there will be no injustice, no inequality. This is the brighter aspect of the situation. But, I am doubtful whether mankind will win on both fronts simultaneously.

The 20th century is a century in the history of mankind devoid of the milk of human kindness. But it has a brighter aspect i.e., man is fighting against every kind of injustice. If man succeeds in this fight, by the turn of century he can reach a stage

when the world will be without injustice. But at the moment this can be thought of only on a theoretical plane.

THE FIVE IMPERIALISMS

Besides armament, there are other type of injustices in the world. Some of them are : Lebensraum imperialism, or international landlordism, is the first of the unapprehended criminals. Countries like the United States and Soviet Russia have enormous space with little density of population. Accidents of history alone have gifted these enormous land masses. Cruel barbarism has incidentally been a contributory factor to such accidents. Siberia and Australia are peopled at one person to the square mile. Canada is not much different California is well under ten persons to the square mile. We may contrast these with the densities of 350 persons to the square mile in India and nearly 200 in China. If landlordism within a country can be so unsavoury to the progressive, as it out to be, what of this international landlordism ? Some day, somebody or perhaps the whole of mankind will have to set right these unjust turns of history.

Mind--imperialism is as much a mark of our times as any other. It is true that there is a willingness on the part of the intellectual imperialist to impart his learing though not necessarily all the skills or the situation of elemental awakening, to the colonials of the mind. It may be pointed out that a similar mind-imperialism exists internally in India. Certain castes have become mind-imperialists through long tradition. One might say that several thousand years of division of labour by birth have been acting almost like a natural selection. On the world stage, this has been going on for about 400 years. The white mind-imperialist would be just as wrong as the coloured high-caste, native mind-imperialist. If we were to deny all responsibility for this situation and content himself with the nostrum of equal opportunity. Equality of opportunity can only continue and deepen the injustice of mind-imperialism. Only through unequal and privileged opportunities to colonials of the mind can mind-imperialism be absolished.

A third such hidden tyranny is productivity-imperialism Everyone knows that Russia and America with roughly one-eighth

of the world's population produce more than half of its wealth. The landless labourer in India earns eight annas or ten American cents a day, while his opposite number in the US earns about Rs. 25 or five American dollars a day. Russia and America produce wealth worth between Rs. 8,000 and Rs. 14,000 per person per year, while India has to be content with a paltry sum of Rs. 400 per person per year. Russia and America are growing each year at the rate of Rs. 250 per person per year, while the corresponding amount in India is just Rs. 5. The idea is not to apportion blame, at least not in the present. The basis for this productivity-imperialism may be traced to ancient exploration. If there is exploration today, it is more or less with the willing consent of those exploited. No imputation of blame or any other kind of accusation must be read into this. The situation has to be recognised. If we the human race are to be one, this situation must be deeply understood and remedied.

Weapons-imperialism is a necessary corollary of the previous imperialism of perhaps their source, and it is not so hidden. Russia and America have often agreed in their drafts on the need to keep the knowledge and the reality of nuclear weaponry to themselves. Some of the progressive Americans and Russians would be shocked if they were told that this amounts to weapons-imperialism of the white against the coloured. The coloured people have indeed no right to fret or fume. They are more than willing to stockpile any old conventional weapons while the pay worshipful homage to the unilaterialist disamer in Euro-America. Such is the split mind of the coloured man. Once again it is not a question of blame or accusation, but of simple recognition of a situation in which one part of mankind possesses almost the ultimate in weapons.

Price-loot-imperialism is the fifth one in this category with which I shall stop the present enumeration. Price movement and the terms of trade are almost always unfavouarable to agriculture and producer of raw materials. If the prices of manufactures have gone up by a hundred per cent in the last ten years, primary produce has increased just by 74 per cent. Robbery on this score alone must be running into billions every year. I dare say that there is a similar internal price-loot in the relationship between man factures and primary produce. But that aggravated to a very large extent by presence of indirect taxation. One hearts

most every day of foreign aid and the philonthropic motives involved in it. The taker of gifts must indeed be contrite and humble at least until the taker has learned not to missuse gifts and both he and the giver have become aware of the world situation as a whole. However, one never hears of the price-list inherent in every item of international trade between the white and the coloured.

Against each of these imperialisms, India and China and all the other coloured people should have been able to act with firmness as in unison, They should, of cource, have made every effort to include such white peoples in their ranks and, in fact, invite to leaderships those willing to recognise the world situation. But none of this was to happen. I had sometimes day dreamed in my earlier, years the China and India and the just-minded which would be able some day to knock at the door of Australia, Siberia and California and have them opened. But, the knocking has taken place elsewhere. Bursting with some kind of power, one knows not which, China has sought the easy way out. She has knocked at the Himalayas Not to talk of Australia, she did not even knock at Hong Kong or Macao. She did not have strength enough in her knuckle even for measly enterprises. She has chosen knock where she thought her strength sufficed.

I am compelled to believe that this she ever remain a tragedy of the human race. Enthroned man will work not for the remove of injustice but for the attainment of aims that lie within his reach. The reach of the coloured man must necessarily remain small, even wicked for a long time yet. Not much can, therefore, be expected of the coloured man that sits on throne. Deliverance must come, if it ever will from the white man. He has infinitely greater power and potentially greater intelligence, however he sees the world situation as a whole, may do something about it. Coloured peoples are indeed not out of the arena altogether. Such of them whome little packets of power do not corrupt may take a wider view and the more risky initiative. I must, however, add an item to the theory of the struggle between the white and coloured peoples This struggle will be overcome, if at all, by the intelligence of the white as much as by the self-interest and radicalism of the coloured.

Now let me come to the human despair to which I referred in the beginning. It appears that for any social organization

the first attempt is to build it up and the moment it gathers strength it starts losing its idealism. This is true of any organisation including that of Satyagraha. The Socialist Party has been leading Satyagraha movements though not always successfully and effectively. I feel that to build up the Satyagraha movement we must start making our party strong. Sometimes I have the feeling that so long as the SSP is weak it is easy for us to make our members fight againt injustice, but the moment it will gather strength the attention of its members will be more concentrated on capturing the government machine of the State. If the people who capture state power are idealists determind to do something for the people I welecome it. Let us assume for the moment that SSP becomes old and flabby. Naturally it will start thinking only in terms of capturing power. It is the inexorable law of history that fighters against injustice ultimately end up as maintainers of *status quo.* This can be illustrated even by the Congress Party. That is why I feel that even our Party cannot avoid it and instead of launching struggles and movements it will be more bothered about capturing power and subsequently retaining it. More particularly when the number of legislators will increase and there will be thousand and one ways of distributing favours. We have not succeeded in terms of capturing state power; and, as I have said we may not succeed even after capturing power to maintain our idealism Then defeat becomes our lot. Let me frankly tell you that I do not know the way out. But I may say that the historical forces will always work for the replacement of the rotten organisation by one which is new, energetic and idealistic. So let us not despair.

Sometimes I feel that if a number of people start thinking on the lines I have suggested and diagnose the crisis then this philosophy of despair can be turned into a philosophy of optimism and hopefulness. May be, I am saying this only to forget the hard facts of human existence. Therefore, some time back I said that there are two elements in the SSP, political leadership and messianism. May be that we committed a mistake by attempting to balance the two. It also may be true that in our party the messianic element has been predominant. But if you go into the depth of the problem, history is a witness to the fact that men who have changed the world have been more of a messiah than a politician. Mohammad was the only leader who successfully

played the role of both a politician and a messiah. To my mind Mahatma Gandhi was more of a politician than a messiah.

Recently our Prime Minister said that whereas the equality of a leader lies in compromising, a prophet marches forward with his idealism without making compromises. He said that Gandhi was both a politician and a prophet. He also said that any country going in for unilateral disarmament will not be defeated by any power but the real problem was who could lead this movement. Gandhi alone could have done it. This is to indulge in double-talk. On the one hand, you say that unilateral disarmament is good and on the other hand you cancel it out by pointing out its impossibility. This is childish prattle. The real problem is not whether non violence is meant for the weak or strong. In India at least the weak has resorted to non-violence. Now scholars are saying that Gandhi has no relevance for the future because Gandhi alone was capable of leading such a movement. To my mind it is a trick which is being played on the Indian people.

The task which I have outlined is gigantic. The Socialist Party has taken it up. We must remember that we are not going to get power soon. If we play our role correctly and we are able to find the correct path, it will be historic achievement.

So far I have been talking only about despair. Now I will talk about the Youth Movement in India, since this camp has been organised by the SYS. We must give serious thought as to why we have failed to achieve substantial progress in the last 15 years.

One reason for this failure has been the trick played by the Congress government on Indian Youth. In the name of cultural activities this government has tried to divert the attention of the Indian Youth from the real problems of the country. We must also ask why students agitate for getting a ticket in the cinema hall, but not for the "Banish English Programme".

We must launch massive movement against English. Organize propaganda against English for six months and then you can force teachers not to teach in English. This can be done everywhere. But in non-Hindi areas the fight should be for replacement of English by the regional languages and not by Hindi. We can also organise our students for the security of our frontiers. Thirdly, Foreign Aid is eating into the vitals our country and it helps only the ruling class of India to increase its standard of living. If foreign aid is stopped, the building which is based on a foundation of

sand will start collapsing.

On the religious front we must take the help of Hindu scriptures insofar as they are anti-caste as was dyne by Dayanand. But this is a minor aspect of the situation. On the economic front it is the people of backward caste who own land holdings less than 6½ acres and hence the land revenue must go. On social front we must organise community kitchen. Secondly, we must go in for inter-caste marriages. The people who go in for inter-caste marriages should be given preference in the services. Our political fight against caste system must be directed with a view retaining general franchise. Along with adult franche we must also fight for preferential revolution. In India, revolution for equality will mean the maintenance of privileges of the ruling class. The is primarily due to caste system. Thus, we must destroy caste system by all-out attack. Only the Socialist Party has understood this nature of Indian society.

We must fight against the demon of caste system on all fronts —religious, economic, social and political. Here sometimes it is argued that students should not be used for political purposes. Let me say that I have never used the students. I thought that both students and workers were useless. But now I feel at least from the viewpoint of cities we must bring students and workers to our fold I want to use both these groups for radicalising Indian politics. I want that the Socialist Party should use them for this purpose.

Sometimes you say that you have been launching various movements, but I tell you that these are not called effective movement. In Japan over a lakh of students agitated for more than 20 days and thus they succeeded in getting the American President visit cancelled. You take out only ten or 20 people and call it a movement.

Most of the students use their leadership for getting good jobs after they come out of the college. Your organization has been leading movements based on idealism. You often say that you face difficulties. There is only one answer : if you work hard you will faces less difficulties. Secondly, a revolutionary movement everywhere entails difficulties and sacrifices. Work hard and undergo suffering in order to revolutionise Indian politics.

18

THE FOUR-PILLAR STATE

RAMMANOHAR LOHIA

In order to achieve national harmony coupled with live faith, a vital democracy with a clean administration, the Kisan Panchayat has evolved the concept of the four-pillar state. In time to come, this will perhaps prove to be one of those great ideas which move mankind.

Through various forms of political organization which mankind has hiestherto evolved, the hierarchical principle has almost always come on top. Whether in a monarchy, a dictatorship or a democracy, power tends to get concentrated in a few centres and in a few persons and the hierarchy of less and lesser power is then built up. It has of course not been a case of pure black and white for the popular principle has ever been in combat with the hierarchical and has often achieved small but significant victories.

Federalism has been one of the most liberal principles in constitution-making. But federalism as hithero understood has been a simple matter of dividing state power between a centre and the federating units. Even the most liberal constitutions of the world have been two-pillar constitutions. Some powers has, of course, been conferred on Municipalities and other local bodies by Parliaments. These powers are very limited. They deal with simple questions of sanitation, water supply, primary education and the like. They are a conferment from top and are not a part of the organic law of any land. They are certainly no legislative powers and not even executive in any full way. They do not deal with the

way of life of any community but merely provide the local framework of health or education in which the community pursues the way prescribed for it by superior legislation or other agencies.

At no time perhaps was it possible for an ordinary citizen to take an intelligent or effective part in the total affairs of his country. This is even more difficult in the complicated conditions of today. He is, therefore, left merely with the choice of persons whom he might prefer over others to think and act for him. In the act of chosing he may achieve some degree. large or small, of political understanding. This condition is difficult to change except by the pursuit of some novel directions.

If the total affairs of a country cannot be simplified so as to achieve the active participation of the common man, they have to be cut up in small and yet smaller quantities. Federalism must go whole hog. Sovereign power must not reside alone in centre and federating units. It must be broken up and diffused over the smallest region where a group of men and women live. The next great advance in constitution making will be when a country frames its constitution on the basis of the four-pillar state, the village, the district, the province and the centre, being four pillars of equal majesty and dignity. The Constituent Assembly of India might have done it. It missed its opportunity. It contented itself with a potpouri of European and American constitutions and the Government of India Act which foreign rule had framed.

The four-pillar state is obviously not a mere executive arrangement. It is not as if superior parliaments legislate and the village and district organs are left with the execution of the laws. The four-pillar state is both a legislative and an executive arrangement. It is a way of life and to all spheres of human activity, for instance, production, ownership, administration, planning, education and the like, the four-pillar state provides a structure and a way. The community of a state is to be so organised and sovereign power so diffused of each little community in it lives the way of life that it chooses. Through these various ways of life must indeed run a common bond strong enough to band the numerous communities into a state. How strong must these various bonds be in their four-pillar order must be left for time to determine. No precise list of federal or state or district or village or concurrent subjects can yet be drawn up. Experience and time and perhaps the next Constituent Assembly of India will make precise allocations.

For the present there must be the unhedged will to diffuse power and to let each little community live intelligently consistent with the integrity and the unity of the nation

I may straightaway say that the four-pillar state is not to be confused with the idea of the self-sufficient village. If that were so it would not be a case of the four-pillar state but as in India 700,000 different states. Under the four-pillar state, the 700,000 villages and the hundreds of districts would have numerous bonds, economic as well as cultural, that make them interdependent and combine them into a nation. The idea underlying the four-pillar state is not that of the self sufficient village but of the intelligent and vital village, although the two ideas cross each other at several points. Quite a bit of the pushing about of men and goods seems futile and yet villages are yearning legitimately enough for better and speedier postal connections.

I may be permitted to indicate certain illustrations of the four-pillar state which may or may not turn out to be valid in practice but which are adequate pointers of directions and polity. The armed forces of the state may be controlled by the centre, the armed police by the province but all other police may be brought under district and village control. While industries like the railways or iron and steel may be controlled by the centre, the small unit textile industry of the future may be left to district and village ownership as management. While price fixing may be a central subject the structure of agriculture and the ratio of capital and labour in it may be left to the choice of the district and the village. Several departments which are at present run by state governments through their servants, for example, those for Co-operative Societies, rural and agricultural development, a substantial part of irrigation, seeds, revenue collecting and the like may be transferred to the village and district. I need not add that a substantial part of state revenues should stay with the village and the district, as in the case of UP, anywhere between 15 and 20 crores out of a total state revenue of over 60 crores should by right belong to the village and the district.

The four-pillar state will provide some answer to the continuing debate on freedom and planning. Not through the mixed economy of social and private ownership but through spreading social ownership over the four-pillars of the state will it be possible to diffuse economic power and the right to make decisions.

No group of central planners will hold undisputed sway and cells of numberless little communities will judge and act and compel sovereign attention. Man will be free as part of his little village. I foresee variations in the ratio of capital and labour as a great lever of freedom. While the rate of capital investments in India as in other undeveloped economies must necessarily be raised perhaps between Rs. 500 and Rs. 1,000 per person, the wide margin between the two possibilties affords an infinite wealth of choices to each village. Some may like more capital and just that little bit which they like to add, while others may like unhurried labour and just that little bit less of tempo which they prefer.

The four-pillar state rises above the issues of regionalism and functionalism. It is a structure which gives meaning even to the functionalist agencies of government and society. One may well conceive of a functionalist splitting of power as between Co-operative Corporations, Trade Unions, Parliaments and the like staying confined to the top. For each functionalist agency may concentrate power in its top leadership. The concept of the four-pillar state diffuses power also within people's organisations and Corporations. I may here add that rancorous voices of provincial narrowness now being raised in India would have been very much subdued, if instead of two colossuses, a centre and a province facing each other, power, including the right to choose its language of primary instruction and commerce, were given to the village community.

The four-pillar state may indeed appear fantastic to many in view of the special conditions of the country, its illiteracy, its fears and superstitions and, above all, its castes. The village representative may indeed be selfish and ignorant and raise caste above justice. And yet to give him power seems the only way to deliver the people from inertia as well as an administration that is both top-heavy and corrupt. The dictatorial or hierarchical principle can never put life into the mass of the people, for they have sunk very low and are utterly disorganised and are yet very numerous; must necessarily make permanent an administration by persons engaged in individual rather than general welfare. The popular principle of the four-pillar state may, on the other hand, cause great confusion and occasion numerous errors and upsets in the beginning but will clean up the administration in

the end by the process of forcing the vast mass to judge and act. For instance, the only way to purify controls is to leave their administration to the village, town and district panchayat and to take them out of the hands of legislators and government servants.

The Congress Party has set its face againts the four-pillar state. It has not even arranged elections to the village panchayats except in one province. Even in that province it has sought to reduce the village representative to the status of the servant of a government servant, it has administered a sinful oath to him and has, by ordinance, suppressed the system of annual elections.

The special conditions of agrarian economy and of a cast and illiterate mass have perhaps made possible the concept of the four-pilar state. And yet that is the way of the future for the world as a whole. The inadequacies of parliamentarian democracy have been met by the equal inadequacies of proletarian dictatorship and either is unable to prevent concentration of power and tyranny. By giving power to small communities of men where democracy of the first grade is possible, the four-pillar state ensures effective and intelligent democracy to the common man.

In the outlining of the six aims, the agricultural labourer may appear to some to have been left out. However, he has always been there more so than any other. His immediate tribulations with regard to false registrations or the total absence of them and the insecurity of homesteads must be a major concern of the Kisan Panchayat. I have advised struggles in areas where false registrations of tenure are numerous and harvests are forcibly cut.

When the Congress got into power, the intial blunder is committed was to dissociate itself, for fear of unrest, from the weak, unorganised and illiterate peasantry, labourers, shopkeepers, salaried people, etc., who have neither time nor capacity yet to take part in politics. The situation that obtains today is that while the British have departed, their proteges, millionaires, princes, landlords and high officials remain. The task of new construction remains unaccomplished. If a ruler fails to show his worth at the very start, he is done for, and his potentialities are exhausted. The U.P. Government failed to abolish Zamindari in the very begining; the result is that it committed the Tughlakian blunder of raising the Zamindari Abolition Fund.

The Congress is further guilty of becoming wise only when the event. It has not planned things, nor is it ready even to

meet situations. The Congress has no policies, and I am not subscribe to the view that it is preserving capitalist policy. The Congress is like a person in a whirlpool reaching out its hands in whatever direction it can without success Thus, while classless sсciety is declared as its goal, the Congress in practice aligns itself with landlords and capitalists. It meddles with the affairs of all sections of the people, but none is be-friended. Under such circumstances, conditions of the pond prevail where each small fish is eaten up by the next bigger one.

PLANLESSNESS

Owing to the planlessness and the initial blunders of the Congress, the country is at a standstill with an ever-increasing population; this means retrogression. Production is declining, poverty is on the increase, and there is disillusionment and distrust all round. There has been no increase in the produetion of food; neither is it possible. The Government had in 1948 announced that import of foodgrains would be stopped in 1949. The Government could not succeed in this. Its fresh resolve to stop food imports by 1951 is certain meet the same fate. It the meantime, famine conditions have already arisen, and from Gujarat and Rajasthan lakhs of cattle have been moved, resulting in considerable death. Human deaths too have sometimes been reported. When the food supply has not increased along with an increase in population, famine is a sure consequence. If land reforms do not come quickly and a food army is not immediately recruited, a famine will be impossible to prevent. For the eminently desirable task of controlling rivers, the government drew up about twenty schemes simultaneosly, without regard for the resources. Several plans of similar nature also resulted in a kind of planlessness.

It has now been found necessary to close down several schemes. If these schemes had also included small scale projects, the means could be secured for their simultaneous implementation. But Government schemes are characteristically paper schemes which fail in the absence of material resources. Successful schemes in India can only be based on the four-pillar state; local effort and improvisation and workability shall be the test, not efficiency.

Industrial production has suffered a similar fate. Government

have not yet learnt that accumulation of capital in the country cannot be achieved through private enterprise. On the one hand there is great need for new industries in the country, and on the other considerable capital has been sent out of the country recently. Among the many reasons for this transfer of capital to Europe and America a major one is that money cannot be turned into industrial capital in the absence of scientific research and invention of machines.

The drain of capital out of India is through illegal means and mainly through foreign trade. Lately, foreign trade has presented a strange story. Government policy has, perhaps, been of allowing enough cosmetics to be imported to keep the people happy. Till now we have been drawing on our resources, and therefore, the full impact of this suicidal policy will not be felt till the sterling balances are exhausted. Nationalisation of foreign assets is essential for the industrial development of the country, but this has not yet been taken in hand. At the present rate the resources are not likel to last for more than two years.

Even existing plants are being closed down, to speak nothing of new ones being started. The habit of learning from experience has resulted in closures of cotton and jute mills. Jute and cotton from Pakistan are not forthcoming; import of cotton from Egypt and East Africa should have been planned long ago. Due to these follies we have had to close down mills, when we should have produced surplus for export to South East Asia which would have strengthened our relations with that area. Some time back there was talk about import of rice from Burma and export of cloth to Indonesia but nothing further has been heard in the matter.

That capitalisation through private enterprise is thoroughly useless is proved by the fact that much capital In the last few years was invested in the vegetable oil industry. Private enterprise seeks profit, whatever it may cost the nation. There are no signs of establishment of a National Investment Board.

Unemployment is on the increase and this in inevitable, As a matter of fact, the major part of the population is under employed, and in the absence of new agricultural and industrial undertakings unemployment is bound to be on the increase. Neither have the Government any set policy in regard to high prices. Compared to war time prices, commodities are four times more expensive.

Matters have been further complicated by various contrary policies adopted by the Government from time to time. At one time the currency was increased; its withdrawal was decided upon some four months back; the circulation has again increased in the past few weeks. In December the circulation was 1,017 crores, and in January it was increased to 1,122 crores. Due to lack of any policy no solution of the problem of high prices is visible. Restrictions on business are either unnecessary are operated by agencies which make honesty impossible.

The ignoranee of the Central Government of economic matters is only matched by its complete failure to establish any standards in the political sphere. The working of democratic system is based on the four concspts of the state, the Government, the party and the individual and on the acceptance of certain conventions in regard to these. During the last four years there has been so complete an absence of any conventions that Government is gradually coming to mean only two persons. It would not be unfair to say that today there are only two Congressmen in the country. Misuse of Government privileges, Government services, the radio, arbitrary promulgation and use of laws and ordinances, reeognition of pet kisan and labour unions and educational institutions—all these are on the increase. Disregard of standards reached its culmination when a sum of Rs. 20 lacs was paid from the Public Exchequer for the expenses of the Jaipur session of the Congress which was purely a party conference. When such conditions prevail, the stage is set for the free play of dishonesty, immorality, unrest, injustice and widespread despair.

Given on p. 323 is an example of land distribution which shows how reactionary can be the resnlts of a do-nothing policy. This is how the refugees from West Punjab have been rehabilitated in East Punjab.

In the absence of definite plans and policies poverty of the body and soul increases. In the resultant gloom men's minds unconsciously turn towards dictatorship. In a sense this country has always hankered after sadhus and incarnations for relief from distress. Acharya Narendra Deva has aptly called it a habit of seeking the easy path. Indeed, there are leaders among all peoples but when a people are robust their leaders are important only in so far as they symbolise ideas and programmes. Some people have appeared on the scene. There are some who under

Number of Claimants	*Total Net allotment in Acres*	*Average Net Allotment*
50	16,822	296.5
66	13,860	210.0
200	31,200	156.0
442	45,366	102.6
879	66,983	76.2
6,245	279,477	44.6
16,599	414,577	24.9
71,624	833,504	11.6
75,248	354,244	4.7
234,707	358,815	1.5
406,060	2,414,848	

the garb of religion and caste are lying in wait to establish such dictatorships. Such dictatorship based on religion ordinarily prove upholders of reactionary systems and protagonists of monarchy manifested in millionaires and landlords and such other people. The wealthy consider poverty a natural and irremediable phenomenon of humanity. Attempts are being made to establish such a dictatorship in the name of religion. Even if such attempts were doomed to failure there is always the danger that these may result in national disintegration.

It fact, religion is now a growing influence over polities throughout the world. Whether in Europe or in Asia conservative elements based on religion are gaining in strength. It would be a welcome sign if politics thereby could become religious but the tragedy is that religion is becoming political.

One of the reasons of this communal danger is of course lack of planning. Another reason is not far to seek. Politics is in the main controversial in nature. In attempting resolution of political conflicts whenever such politics proves futile men's minds turn to religion which is mainly peaceful in character. People expect religion to bring peace and unity. Thus, religion shows itself as a danger wherever politicians fail to bring solace to the soul even in the midst of political conflicts.

Communist dictatorship is another possible peril. There are people who think that the country will either remain Congressite or shall turn communist and that there is no room for

a third camp. External events are the cause of such apprehensions mainly. American's influence, too, is increasing in this country.

In many cases Socialist propaganda gives the impression that the conflict is basically between communism and the Congress. Many Socialists are apt to prophesy that India's following China's fate was inevitable if the Congress Government did not improve. This would mean that communism cannot be averted unless the Congress improves. In fact, if the Socialist Party could grow strong, it could lead the nation correctly whatever the Congress did. By expressing such helplessness, Socialists weaken their own ranks. The same mental attitude expresses itself in negative propaganda or criticism. Unless Socialists initiate positive constructive discussions on our programmes and policies the Congress will continue to hold the field, or else other dangers will appear. Dissatisfaction against the Congress is widespread and increasing, our task now is not to increase the dissatisfaction, but to draw people to the folds of the Socialist Party and the Kisan Panchayat. The great danger we have to ward off is negative criticism.

A PLAN TO END POVERTY

The biggest curse of non-Congress politics is its negativism. To direct the people towards a positive outlook is the main task. They must begin thinking as to what exactly they want and how to get it. I should think this can be done alone by a plan to end poverty. If all sections of the population, farmers and land workers, factory workers and shop keepers, artisans and the free professions, begin to see their hearts' desire reflected in such a plan, an irresistable symphony of people's voice will be heard in place of the noises that cancel each other. Such a plan should be include :

1. Lowering of prices on the basis of parity between agricultural and industrial prices.
2. Austerity and sacrifice to be shared hy all so that no income or salary exceeds Rs. 1000 a month.
3. Industrialisation with the help of small-unit machines, the invention and manufacture of which to be promoted

by the state.

4. Any factory running below capacity to be taken over by the State, and immediate nationalisation of basic industries.
5. Anti-corruption commissioners in every state and at the centre with department independent of the government.
6. Land to the tiller and redivision of land—12½ acres minimum and 30 acres maximum. Correction of wrong entries in Patwaris' registers.
7. Cultivation of 1 crore acres of new land by a state-recruited food army.
8. Decentralisation of administration and economy so as to achieve the four-pillar state. Repeal of discriminatory laws including the criminal tribes Act.
9. Housing programmes and other economic activity to provide full employment.
10. Establishment of polytechnic schools and people's high schools and centres for youth and women for cultural activities.
11. Immediate adult franchise elections in unrepresented areas, that is, merged states and unions.
12. Pursuit of a positive policy of world peace through promoting full freedom and rights for all nations; special and economic equality among a people and between nations, and a peace bloc which can dictate trute to warning Power blocs.
13 Volunteer bands for agriculture, irrigation roadmaking and the like.

If the Kisan Panchayat could release a passionate debate around such a plan in all corners of the country, it would most curely succeed in infusing positivism and faith in our people

Reconstruction of the country is impossible through the ordinarily known ways. Funds through taxation could never suffice for such huge tasks Increase in money circulation, though sound in principle when accompanied by activity and production, has great dangers, especially in an impoverished country like ours. Other means have to be sought.

Unemployment, widespread in the country, is of two kinds.

There are people who are completely idle; there are others who have not sufficient work to do, even though employed. Utilisation of idle hours will perhaps be the greatest objective of successful government. This is impossible of accomplishment on the basis of money payment. It could only become on a voluntary basis. If people would feel themselves the owners of fields and factories, this feeling would bring them the realisation that their personal gains are possible through social activity alone. In addition to the 7 or 8 hour's work for their livelikood they could volunteer to work an hour every day for the nation. It is well-known that a major part of reconstruction in Yugoslavia has been acnieved through a voluntary effort I have calculated that if the 4 crores of adults in the country volunteered an hour's labour every day, the tasks accomplished would equal those which the Government of India gets done by a year's budget. Thus, without raising any new taxes, government's budget can be doubled, which would be impossible otherwise.

Such voluntary activity is only possible through socialism, which will accomplish the double task of bringing a sense of communal ownership and of achieving immediate results of planned production through voluntary effort.

In countries that have been free for a long time and are rich politics can be based on perodic and scattered movements. But in our country we have to start building up national wealth. The prevailing mood of despondency is most unfortunate for country in such a situation. It should be the task of an organisation like the Kisan Panchayat to instil faith into the people through constructive activity. The very sight of rural reconstruction through voluntary effort will bring confidence and faith to the hearts of men and women.

For another matter, it is not possible for more than a few people to be absorbed in propaganda work. Is the Kisan Panchayat to ask people merely to pay four annas and become members ? Only when the Panchayat will be able to extract work out of the members and their associates, will as strength increase. On this idea is based the scheme of the irrigation army or the 'an hour to the nation.' I am happy to note that active volunteers in several places have started digging canals and ponds and constructing bunds. The Kisan Panchayat must undertake to spread this work further. It should be keen on undertaking all

work that could be accomplished on voluntary basis. It shall even have to get down to small things. For example, if people would chew well while eating, and not merely swallow food, their health would improve and much food would be saved. If voluntary efforts spread in the villages, the battle for reconstruction as also for socialism shall have been won.

The Kisan Panchayat should be strong enough to help peasents get over their difficulties. Its membership should run into millions and its workers should be found in every village. Able workers are needed to achieve such ripeness of organisation. Ordinarily, our workers make little effort to equip themselves either for assuming power or even for working among the peasants whose many problems can be solved only throngh knowledge and understanding. Our future plans have to be directed towards training up specialists of various problems. This will bring the additional advantage of eliminating personal rivalries and bickerings.

The task of reconstruction must be accompanied by destruction : construction of the good and destruction of the bad. Old land laws have to be abolished, casteism, nepotism have to be eliminated, conflicts within the poor class have to be resolved.

The system of education in the country needs drastic changes. It is conducive neither to research nor to technical accomplishment. Countries like Germany and Sweden have been developed by workers and peasants who have never been to technical colleges or universities, but have off and on been to polytechnics The People's Universities of their countries also deserve mention.

Possibly, the defects of our educational system are due to the prevalence of a foreign language, which has given an air of imitativeness to the whole country. Perhaps also, due to the foreign language the continuity of education from olden times has got broken, at the education of today has not found any roots in the Indian soil. I sometimes wish that all departments of the University excepting Science and Engineering may be closed for five years. This might enable the educational system to be given new foundations.

In any case, the entire country should have a network of polytechnics and peoples' universities for the benefit of peasants, workers and the poor middle class.

The entire field of culture, including art, drama and music,

has lost the vital contact with the people and soil of the country. The result has been disastrous. For example, the songs that have come into vogue induce moroseness and lathargy. There is great need of a network of culture centres, centres for young men and women where programmes of music drama and discussions would be initiated. Governments should be helpful in such programmes. Kisan Panchayats should devote as much time and attention to this as possible.

As in the field of education, much needs to be done in the field of social medicine. The poor are broken down with the worry of disease and the expense of treatment. Government must take up this work, even if with small beginnings. It is also necessary to check the increase in population.

ORGANISATION

It is a strange India that has emerged after the attainment of independence. During slavery there was drankness without, but light within. Now it is the reverse. Nothing remains to attract millions together in pursuit of a common deal. Disintegration is widespread. Blames in the national character which attend such disintegration are also shapping themselves. The passion for freedom had till now kept into the background faults of character and organisation, which are now visible and increasing in the absence of any ennobling ideal. Nevertheless, the hunger for equality has entered into national life. This fact has till now shown only negative aspects : it has assumed forms of hatred and vilification, but has not been able to mobilise people to militant positivism. The hunger for equality finds its constructive manifestation in the policies and programmes of the Kisan Panchayat and the Socialist Party. Those policies are capable of satisfying the hunger both for equality and for a new civilisation. A tragic phenomenon Indian life today is that social disintegration is accompanied by centralisation of political power, while the ideal would be an integrated society with power decentralised. Constructive manifestations of the hunger for equality seems to be the only means of bringing about such a happy state of affairs Rifts between different parties are natural, but rifts within parties are a new feature. Without a tangible ideal people are apt to become touchy, cliquish and power-seekers; the result is disintegration.

Negligence and irresponsibility are signs of such times. What greater negligence can there be that workers of a party should be careless about subscriptions of new members ?

Who does not know that this great flow is to be found at several places in the Kisan Panchayat ? It has now become too common a fault to get delegates elected not by the general body of members but by the executive. While it is true that the only solution to this is the introduction of a purpose and an ideal we must beware of this flaw of character and must not thereby seek any temporary advantage or gains.

The work of the Kisan Panchapat has uptil now been a oneway flow. Organisers think they are teachers of the people. Such a phychology produces bad results : first, this is an incorrect assumption, secondly, the teaching itself remains incomplete. What is necessary is a two-way flow. Organisers should be prepared to teach as well as be taught by the people. In this alone lies the hope of developing the latent powers of the country and the peasants.

It is true that the Kisan Panchayat is drawing to its fold those who have been downtrodden for centuries. But its task recomplete due to this one-way flow. I shall not forget the occasion when the wife of Sukhdev Choudhuri. disowned for centuries, came finely dressed to my meeting. Nor will forget that a sweeper named Somewshwar secured an advance payment of his wages to pay a donation.

The moral well-being of the nation can be gauged by its women, and the women of the so-called depressed classes at that. While I have met brave and upright women belonging to the upper class, Kamla reared by the non-English knowing Kisans of Narnaul, has demonstrated what great violent this section of the people has. That the talent has been formant, or has. whenever it has come out, shown itself incompletely or in indisciplined ways is due rigorous social graditions.

Communinists have in one matter scored over us. I need not repat that I consider the Communist Party harmful for the people. Nevertheless, the communists were able to bring in life the soul of a washer-women, Munni, who we hear, is leading an underground movement in some villages. Even if other meetings she abuses the Kishan Panchayat and the Socialist Party, I salute this woman because she symbolises those classes on whose awakening depends

the awakening of the nation. Real success will be achieved only when washer-women, char-women and such others will join the Kisan Panchayat and the Socialist Party and work for these.

The country has got into a morass. It will not be though to argue that the Kishan Panchayat has nothing to do both casteism. We must awaken the downtrodden classes and bring out their mettle. Unless this is done, the Kisan Panchayat, will bog into the familiar politics of today. We found that manipulating the chiefs of castes and sects; we would still the fatal error of counting on the womenfold following their men. By such ways the Kisan Panchayat will always be a loser : immediately, because the Congress will invariably succeed in such methods; in the long run, because no real awakening is possible through such methods. Our task is to break the shackles of society, to bring flow to the waters that have grown stagnant. This is possible only when there is a real flowering of the social forces that are now dormant.

While we have such mightly tasks befor us, the poverty of the mind and body of the nation is increasing. Elections are yet far off; the malady may become irremediable by then. Despondency may take deep roots, making awakening impossible for years, there may be sporadic uprisings in the absence of organised effort, resulting in disintegration. Peace and plenty must go together. Where there is no plenty, peace can prevail only if the people grow completely despondent; if there are sporadic attempts at revolt, firings and lathi-charges disturb the peace. I foresee both these dangers. It thus appears fatal to wait for the elections and do nothing else.

We must find a way out. One such ways is that everyone should select for himself a sphere of work which would satisfy the hunger for equality. The plan to end poverty should so enter the minds and hearts of all sections of the population that people will again rally round a single objective. If such a unification takes place in the coming months of this year, the government may then be invited to implement the plan. If the government refused, Satyagraha may be launched.

It is sinful to be idle spectators of the collapse of nation. It becomes essential to declare oneself a fighter against injustice. If the people express themselves in a peaceful manner the government shall have to act according to the wishes of the people; else, the government itself shall be changed. But change of government

cannot be the objective of Satyagraha; the demand will be for a changs of policy.

It is argued that there is no place for Satyagraha now that we are independent. Governments are always likely to cry. And in the abnormal times, the entire policies of the government have been wrong. To correct wrongs and to right injustices, Satyagraha is justified even in a free country. Empty become inevitable to use this weapon in the coming year, because continuance of existing conditions will be disastrous. Realise that governments will be difficult to run if Satyagraha was offered every day. But, the Satyagraha I visualise will not be for anything less than the good of the entire nation. Further, the distinction between state and government has not yet got established; which will take time. After this tradition has been established, the need for Satyagraha will diminish.

While I talk of Satyagraha as a means of removing poverty, the government demands the co-operation of the people. Ministers have been heard saying that their governments could achieve nothing without the people co-operating. In no other country could a minister talk in this strain; such accomplaint would mean acceptance of government's failure and its consequent resignation. But it is true that a government is a reflection of the people, and many hold that we can get a good government only when the people become hard working. Improve in character and grow politically mature. Undoubtedly such improvements are essential. A first essential to such an improvement of the people is that they should no longer tolerate bad governments. The people should demand from by government the end of poverty. If government fails to take appropriate steps, the people should resort to Satyagraha. This will bring strength to the people, and they will also get over the habit of tolerating everything.

Such Satyagraha would be a true means and form of operation between the government and the people. Today, government has neither the means nor any plan to end poverty. So the people should accept the plan and then press government to accept it.

To answer the question if class struggle is valid as a mode of agrarian organisation in India, one has to find out if the class struggle actually exists in agrarian relationships and if so of what order it is. When class struggle is a reality, it can and must become the method to achieve its own abolition. The issue is

simple where big estates are ranged against masses of tenants, share-croppers or agricultural labourers. The clash of class interests exists and class struggle becomes a potent mode of organisation in the areas of big estates. This is so in India as elsewhere.

Around 10 per cent of cultivated lands in India are held in holdings of more than 30 acres and the vast majority of the agrarian population consists of small landlords, tenants of various types, unregistered tenants and share-croppers and landless labourers. They are all very poor but their mutual relationships are exceedingly complicated. They fight among themselves, for they are the submerged classes of an impeirialist economy and their poverty is colossal. Each wars against all for his share in the national larder that does not grow but whose shares multiply with each year. A static larder and a growing population give rise to fight among themselves which is as cruel as it is meaningless, as only the fight among the poor can be. A further complication is caused by the factor of caste. It makes the fight hideously cruel. The illusion of conflict, that has no valid existence in economy, becomes a deeply cherished emotional reality. Nothing has robbed the Indian people of vitality as much as caste; it has cut them up into a multitude of stagnant and turbid little pools.

But, the class struggle does not exist in the relationship of this vast agrarian population. What exists is a number of group tensions, often exceedingly cruel. The tensions among the poor may be·overcome in the realisation of a greater identity, of a casteless and egalitarian village building itself up co-operatively. Damage of no small dimensions will be caused if these tensions assume the illusory shape of class conflict and if peasent agitators get tempted to imitate the traditional modes of factory unionism. Organisation of agricultural labourers, for instance, must be treated as an auxilary to the under peasant movement. It is true that, in the overcoming of these tensions, the twin principles of an egalitarian village, that to the tiller belongs the harvest and that caste should not exist, must never be lost sight of.

Traditional socialism has treated the farmer cavalierly. European socialism and coummunism have drawn their main strength from the vast masses of factory workers and they have disliked the farmer, both because he is an owner of property and an exactor of high prices for their food. They have, therefore, dubbed him a reactionary and, even after the Russian experience,

tacitly presume him to be so. During favourable times and at his best, he may become a helpmate and ally, but, with sucess of the revolution, he must be cured into the worker of a collective farm. This absurd theory, universalised from a partial European and American experience, has done some damage to the cause of socialism among the peasantry.

Indian socialists have long given up this theory in their practice, even if some of them occasionally betray loose ends in their thinking. In fact, a contrary swing is evident. The behaviour or factory workers in the national sturggle, the paucity of their numbers and the variety of their organisations are directing Indian socialism into an agrarian expression. That is right. But, a theory as absurd as the one that raised the factory worker into the sole agency of the revolution, is being propounded to elevate the farmer into the sole instrument of the new order and as the source of vitality. Undoubtedly the farmer in India, as elsewhere has a great role to play, than whom none is greater, but others may have equal roles to play. The talk of subsidary alliances between farmers and workes and artisans and city poor must be replaced by the concept of equal relationships in the revolution.

This concept of the farmer as the builder of the new order has a basis in reality. As to the price of agricultural produce, the principle of parity with industrial produce, removes either way exploitation between farmers and the rest of society. As to the fact of property in land which the farmer uses, the principle must be recognised that no denial of socialism takes place if the property used does not entail employment of another's labour. Actually, it may be an affirmation of socialism and an enriching of its ways hitherto unknown.

After land has been redivided on an egalitarian basis, the hunger for land and the sense of possessing will disappear. What will remain is initiative and independence of spirit coupled with the desire of collective well-being. Farmers of the future may evolve multiple patterns and hues of village life, from co-operation in the minimum to collective living of a type unattainable by others. They will be able to make use of such technical aids as they choose. A rich variety of socialist living and experimenting will open out. It is the picture of a casteless and egalitarian village that beckons us into overcoming existing group tensions.

The vast agrarian masses of India, except the big landlords, are the great builders of socialism, one and all of them.

A civilisation in the building of which workers on land have taken their full share may yet achieve the brotherhood of egalitarian and co-operative living. It has no use for the frenzy, which, results in tyranny and wars. Close to the soil and Nature, the farmer is naturally responsive to the call for peace and world government. If only he can be roused from the stupor and inertia into which he has fallen in Asia, Africa and South America, he can yet build a civilisation of tranquil activity. Towards this end, let the Kisan Panchayat strive. Farmers all over the world are only too willing when, in strength, he can give them his hand with the hope of a better world.

19

PROGRAMME TO END POVERTY

RAMMANOHAR LOHIA

Indian poverty is largely due to dearth of capital and lack of tools. The Indian has to produce wealth with tools and capital worth Rs. 150 while the West European commands over Rs. 3,000 worth of production equipment.

Foreign capital cannot bridge this gap. Not even a billion dollar loan can raise the per head capital in India by more than Rs. 10 so that it could at the most be raised to Rs. 160.

Native capital is wholly incapable of this task. The last five years conclusively show that Indian capital does not invest in the industries that support life and give health. Its largest investments have been in the artificial ghee industry and the cinema and pharmaceuticals have probably followed. This is only natural. The industries and occupations of food, cloth and housing although highly necessary for the health and well-being of the people retain no scope for quick and high profits. A dairy means a long period of waiting and rather low and uncertain profits at the end of five years and more, while a plant of artificial ghee means quick and high profits. By its own showing, capitalism has condemned itself.

The State alone can form capital and provide tools and organisation for new and healthy occupations and to do that it must have a plan on the basis of social ownership of new capital and must plan for the nation as a whole.

The 13-point programme to end poverty contains two main

items of capital formation : (1) Food Army, and (2) Industrialisation, particularly with the help of cottage industry machines. No industrialist or federation of industrialists can promote the invention of machines or their manufacture. Indian record inventing machines is to date zero. The State must new step in.

Capital is past earnings turned into tools. In the first place. Indian savings are very low and in the second place even these cannot be turned into tools for lack of production goods industries. The State alone can step up both men and women The girls must get over their diffidence.

The works of this group should get maximum publicity and then alone we can ask for outside help.

Question 1. What do you maan by emancipation of women in Germany ?

Answer : Theoretically, we have the same rights as men in Germany. But in practice it is different. Woman don't get the same wage as man in factories and in various other fields. Men do not want a cut in their salary. Our group in the 'new left is working on this problem. Trade unions can fight for these rights. Young woman could organise protest meetings and campaigns. In the economic field women have not yet achieved equality with men.

Psychologically, the problem of inferiority amongst women is there. The girls don't have their opinions and seldom dare to speak in boys' presence, if they have any. Though suppression is not obvious, it is still there. In spite of the intelligence, the women do not get over their inferiority complex. In such circumstances, boys must help the girls in solving these problems. Otherwise, it is impossible for women to the emancipated. The reason is the whole bourgeois tradition of keeping woman confined to kitchen and upbringing of children. It takes time to wipe out this tradition completely. Some men want women to work as well as to manage home. However, 'new left' boys are different.

On matters concerning sex, emancipation would mean that a woman, married or unmarried, should have the frredom to determine her own sex relations. Marriage is a bourgeois institution. In Germany, married people get tax relief, while the unmarried suffers. This is discriminatory.

Free sex does create psychological problem. In Sweden, as an experiment in community living, six pairs of boys and girls

tried to live in the same house as a big family. They breed children together. Upbringing of the children is joint responsibility. In West Berlin too a group tried to do the same. But they overstressed it. Freedom to choose should be there. They should not be dogmatic. Beurgeois education continued to affect their minds. Likes and dislikes must be there.

Sex for fun sake is permissible, but it should not be kind of a neurotie impression on mind. Any sex act free of tradition and spontaneous would be welcome even if it is for fun sake. Positive side spontaneity—both are participants, may look foolish to do something which comes from 'inside'. We should try to find our 'self' and not what society has made of us.

Question 2 : You sound like Hippy. Where do you differ from them ?

Answer : Though the forms are same, the hippies are different. They are unpolished. They live for 'self' and for 'moment'. They do not want to change the society. They escape from it. Spontaneous feeling would always be lacking in capitalist society. By political training we want to free the young generation. We have political responsibility. We are working for revolution. No revolution is possible with ill-personality or politics. No emancipation is possible in a capitalist society. Emancipation and capitalism are contradictory in terms. Simultaneously, the change should be effected and the society emancipated. If I have success in personal or psychological revolution then if I would get enough strength for political and social revolution. They are intermingled.

Question. 3 : Whose responsibility shall be the children in the society you envisage ?

Answer : The children would be the responsibilities of the commune, of the families who live together. It is not like husband-wife family. Recognition should be given to the mother. The society would be neither Patriarchal nor Matriarchal. Everybody should fulfil his own wishes without disturbing others. I would even like to rear up my children without getting married. I and my friend are trying to emancipate ourselves. But we are brought up in such a way that theoretically though we don't object, psychologically it may create problems. We want to live in community way. In our society it is difficult to practice this. Still we are trying to find friends to live together. While

trying to live together we discovered some problems. We have to try but not to overstress.

Question 4 : What do you think of the emancipation of Indian women.

Answer : They are unemancipated, because they are not economically free. They are absolutely dependent on men, father or husband. Even the social problems have economic roots. Number of working girls is very small in India compared to men. When this number goes up then there would be more of discussion.

Question 5 : Do you think that preferential opportunities for women would help their emancipation ?

Answer : The danger is that emancipation is necessary not only of the suppressed but also of the suppressors. The method could be a method of emancipation in India. It sounds bit idealistic. Men can't be convinced of this. However, to campaign for preferential opportunities for women would help the process of emancipation in India.

GREAT BRITAIN

Question 1 : Do you consider yourself to be an emancipated woman ?

Answer : Yes, I am educated and I earn my own living. I am not dependent on man. Even when married I can earn my own living. Because of my economic independence, I have independence ideas. When married, I would have equal position in decision-making. Of course, I am not as free as a man at all. A woman's social position is different because of motherhood. She has less of liberty than man.

Question 2 : What is the position of young women in your society ?

Answer : Girls have less freedom than boys. It is harder for girls to get educated than boys. For people think that education for girls is a wastage. It is much harder to get into Medical education for girls than boys. They think girls would get married and have children. People who are running medical training in England are very old-fashioned. Even travelling to India by myself caused surprise to many. During my travel, when I was in Muslism countries, like Turkey, Iran, Afghanistan and Pakistan, I had to be shy and careful. India is like England—a great relief. There

is much freer atmosphere. I would never have travelled alone on the streets in Muslim countries, which I do in India.

Question 2 : Some girls feel psychologically inferior to men. What is your opinion ?

Answer : I don't feel inferior to men, some girls do. I had co-education and in political movements I have been with men. Young women hold to their own but the old-fashioned don't. There are some professions, which are harder for girls to enter. Research Laboratories for example If there are male technicians it would be very difficult for a woman to become their boss.

Question 3 : In the Labour Party Conference there was a move to get for women wages equal to men. How do you feel about it ?

Answer : There should be equal wages for men and women. But the trouble is that man thinks that he is the main bread winner and woman is extra. However, in teaching profession wages are same but teachers are poorly paid. That is why not enough men are there in teaching. In factory woman is not considered a serious wage-earner.

What is needed is a change in the wage-structure in my country. Everybody should be paid according to needs. A campaign should be launched for this. I would stake my political for a complete revolution and not for partial gain. I would not expect a boy friend or husband to pay for me for whole of my life. Equal wage movement is right, but not sufficient enough to bring a revolution. There should also be a revolution in the running of an industry. Worker has no pride in what he works. Man should work more by himself—he should know all that is happening around. He should not be a cog in the machine. Trade unions only ask for money. They don't work for basic change in social structure. My ideas are akin to Gandhian way of industrialisation and community life. Democracy in England is insufficient for the development of man's personality. There should be more of local governments, so that individuals could take more part in it.

Question 4 : What do you think of emancipation of women in terms of her sex relations ?

Answer : Individuals should choose how to live. If people want, they could have free sex-relations. Promiscuity is no better than chastity. I won't like to judge people either way. However, one

should be responsible about the children. Secure upbringing of the child is necessary and not to give him that is great immorality. Marriage is not a bourgeors institution. But an ideal society won't need marriage. Important relationship is parenthood. I hate marriage as an institution. Family is a happy way of living. Men and women need children and children need mothor the father. Marriage should not be binding. Everything should be voluntary.

It is not necessary to marry to bear a child. Yet the man as a father should not disappear. Man and woman might still live together, but there should be no pressure on man to live with children. Any institution is bad, including marriage.

Question 5 : What do you think of 'community living' as being experimented by some young men and women in Sweden in West Germany or in any other part of the West ?

Answer : In ancient civilisation people lived like that Relationship becomes superficial. I would like to see deeper relationship between mother and child, father and child. I like community living for child away. A master campaign of literacy can be easily undertaken in a four-pillar State which has been rid of landed and capitalist ownership.

Recreational education is as false and barren as any other aspect of Indian life. Often young students have no other diversion except to march up and down the main road of their town and look at the fashion and vanities of women. Of any adventure in the realm of ideas and human relationships there is but little. Strains of songs also produce a mental state of impotent complaint All this must stop.

The programme to end poverty makes it incumbent upon the State to start or help in the starting of cultural institutes, youth clubs and women's clubs. This will undoubtedly bring variety and joy into the songs and talk of the people.

Finally, the Anti-Corruption Department of the State must be, like High Court Judges, independent of the Government. The four-pillar State, by making the village or the city community largely responsible to itself, by handing over a large part of the administration to it, will remove such corruption as inevitably comes in India with the system thas rules from above.

The philosophical elements in character formation are very decisive but they form a different story.

—*Naomi Brent*

20

WHERE THE MIND IS WITHOUT FEAR*

RAMMANOHAR LOHIA

I am astonished at the Foreign Minister's feat. He is an adept in tying up people. He has tied up some in the Sino-Russian tangle, some in the Kashmir imbroglio, and a few others in the Voice of America agreement so that none, either from this side or from that, can view the foreign policy from a comprehensive standpoint, and my first say in this regard is that the foreign policy has failed totally. The Foreign Minister himself has set two tests : that of the country's interest and, secondly, internationalism.

Insofar as the first one is concerned it is universally known that our land has shrunk by about 17 or 18 thousand square miles compared to what it was on 15th August, 1947, and if we take the traditional lines of Kailash and Mansarovar, the loss will amount to about one hundred thousand square miles. In regard to the other test, internationalism, I do not know of any bold or big steps, save in the Indonesian episode, taken by this government by way of initiating new trends or *nesting* new horizons. I think, save for those early two or three years of Independence, the country's foreign affairs have been wholly dependent on others, on the Russian veto for Kashmir and on the American dollar for planning. A nation that is dependent on others on such vital issues as these sometimes can brag about independent policies but in actual

*Speech on Foreign Policy 17th September, 1963, in Parliament (Translated from Hindi).

practice, cannot pursue them. We cannot hope for independent action as long as we do not rid ourselves of this position of dependence.

On the other hand, our affairs are governed by fear. We did not accord recognition to the noble government of Algeria, while most of the Asian and African nations did so, because we were afraid of the Atlantic camp. China was far ahead of us. Similarly, we fear the Arab countries when it comes to the question of recognising Israel; yet Yugoslavia, which has recognized the Israel government, is at present the most friendly country for the Arabs. We were paralysed by the same sort of fear in the Congo and could not do anything at the moment of Patrick Lumbumba's murder. The fear was that any interference with that country's partitioning would provoke the Atlantic block. In Hungary we feared Soviet Russia, and, although in the Suez crisis our altitude was correct, we were, nevertheless, a bit afraid to send our pilots at Hoogly up the Suez cannal. We are afraid of the Chinese in Tibet, and now are afraid of them in Urvasiam. As a result of all this, our foreign policy is never up to the mark.

I shall quote here a line from Tagore. The Foreign Minister often refers to it in a foreign version, but I shall quote the Original "*Chitta jetha bhay shunya*" (Where the mind is without fear). Well, India's foreign policy is not without fear and that is the main reason why we cannot succeed and cannot do any good to the people. Our failure is not due simply to the fact that we are poor or that our army is ill equipped, but because our foreign policy has no principled base, no thought-out plans, and is incapable of dreaming It does not look ahead. We had tremendous possibilities. We had 44 crores of men or, in a sense, 60; we had Mahatma Gandhi, and an ancient civilization. How many nations can boast of such advantages at the very outset ? But absence of principles has nullified everything.

I shall give an illustration of our unprincipled foreign policy. As far back as 1949. I said that we should recognize a government if it is in actual possession of a land. The External Affairs Ministry seems to have theoretically accepted this rule, according to which we should have recognized Mao's government in mainland China, and, by the same logic, Chiang's in Formosa. This, however, was not done, and as a result the true picture of Communist China could not be projected in the African and Asian countries. A

wrong impression was created. That communist Asia and pseudo-Socialist Asia are birds of the same feather, for a genuinely Socialist Asia did not exist and was not projected.

The manner in which the Sino-Indian conflict is being viewed in India indicates to me the fear that even in the years to come India's foreign policy will drift along barren paths. For in the whole of yesterday's speech by the Foreign Minister there was only a solitary item of policy. The rest was incidental. The big thing for him was the Sino-Russian conflict which is of considerable help to us in our struggle against China. The blind and the lame always need a crutch. When one crutch breaks another is sought out. I am, however, of the belief that India even now has the potentiality to stand on her own legs, provided, of course, that we adopt the right principles. We need to understand the real nature of the conflict between Soviet Russia and China.

Ravana was a great scholar. China is a powerful monster. We have to analyse the sources of its power. With almost as little wealth of military strength as ourselves it has the courge to stand as a rival against Russia and other white powers. It has become symbol of the coloured world. In Africa and Asia whatever governments may come or go people's hearts seem to more with the Chinese. China has helped the African freedom struggles more than any other country by words as well as deed.

Our appreciation of China, however, cannot be an unqualified one. I already have called it a monster. It has adopted brutal means on a large scale for solving political problems it seeks to solve the injustice of white-coloured differences through violence alone, and yet, from another point of view, it would seem as if this beast turned away from Maao, Hongkong, Formosa or Quemoy lest its teeth would break, and attacked the soft flesh of the Himalayas.

If we merely try to seek a crutch from the Sino-Russian conflict we again shall commit a mistake, and since yesterday it is my apprehension that our foreign policy is entering a new desert. Seeking crutches is silly. Our duty is to help the coloured nations. The External Affairs ministry is frightened of such a policy lest that would irritate the U.S.A., Russia or some other white nations and their governments. To some extent it is true that an independent policy will irritate them, but a policy dictated by fear will never command respect, But there are any number of white men

and women who want all injustices to be destroyed including that between the white and coloured.

It makes me sad to think that even now India tries to secure Communist China's recognition at the U.N. India's policy during the last 15 years has created confusion in the whole of Asia. Politics in Asia is vitiated by corruption, nepotism, lack of principles and lack of ideas. India has to raise pillars of principted politics in this mire of confusion. My foremost advise, therefore, is that our Government should start erecting them here and now, and the work can be very well begun by a declaration that we are not prepared to recognize China at present, but that on principle we would recognize two Chinas.

When I said this in 1949-50 it was dismissed as nonsense. But now it is said that Soviet Russia, too, was considering it at that time with a view to easing tensions in the world. Why is India's Government so frightened of bold ideas? India's rulers are followers of those leftists in Britain who mediate between the Labour Party and the U.S.S.R. They are a small section of British Labour. Iudian diplomacy acts on feelers sent by them. India advocates summit talks between America and Russia on their suggestion. Her advocacy for disarmament, later for nuclear disarmament and lastly for suspension of nuclear tests had the moral and intellectual bicking of this coterie. India's rulers never have put forth any new or original plans in view of the peculiar conditions prevailing in Asia and Africa. I would, have liked for instance, this government to suggest to the leaders of America and Russia to hold a summit discussion not only on disarmament of world peace but also on steps for the removal of poverty in the world. This can be taken up even now. India should try to persuade Mr. Kennedy and Mr. Khruschov to sit together somewhere for five or seven days to discuss ways and means for the banishment of poverty and for the removal of disparity in the prices of agricultural and industrial commodities. This disparity results in exploitation of sections of people within a nation and weaker nations internationally. The prices of agricultural commodities increase by three-fourths of the rate of increase in industrial prices and, as a result of this price loot, India gives comparatively more to the U.S.A. and Russia than she received as aid from them.

The question may be raised as to how Messrs. Khruschov and

Kennedy can be persuaded to do this. Why should the white, industrial, prosperous nations agree to solve the problem of the coloured, agricultural and poor nations ?

In reply, it may be pointed out that a new dimension has appeared in the world scene since 1945. The coming two or three decades will see either the end of all weapons or of the world. Before 1945, it was for a Jesus or a Gandhi to condemn the use of weapons while their effectiveness was not questioned; but weapons now have become useless. I am talking of the real weapons of today, and not of the petty muskets with which Indians and Chinese fight. The real weapons of today which the U.S.A. and the U.S.S.R. possess are not being used and shall not be used, for their use will wipe out two-thirds of the earth's population. The coming two or three decades will decide their fate. Where only a Gandhi or a Jesus have denounced weapons as immoral, a Bismark may rise to destroy them as useless, and when I say Bismark I do not mean an individual who is by himself a powerless thing An individual can perform great deeds only when he acts as a symbol or as a member of some party, group or community.

So, either weapons will come to an end or the world will come to an end, and weapons can be done away with only when injustice is done away with. India's foreign policy can hope to succeed only when India's government will decide to march unhesitatingly with the seven revolutions now going on the world over.

I have mentioned earlier about touch revolutionaries Shri Asoka Sen was good enough to ask what it meant. In order to understand it you have to know about two universities in U.K. where all the undergraduates are revolutionaries. You do not need to change anything, destroy anything old or begin anything new, but, simply, you have to do this; when a revolutionary comes to visit your country, stand by his side, touch him and feel like a revolutionary yourself. That is touch revolutionarism, and as long as this satisfies our people our foreign policy cannot dream, cannot look ahead and cannot do anything in a big way. When I talk in this vein people accuse me of being unpractical. I retort by asking them : what has our foreign policy achived so far ? What has been its concrete out-come ! Have we been able to exert any influence over our neighbours ? We must have some vision, some ideal to push us ahead. So long as this is wanting, there can be only fake messianism and diplomacy based on

cleverness. That is how I characterise India's foreign policy of the last 15 years, thoughtless, without vision and unprincipled.

A major test of foreign policy success is one's relationship with the neighbourhood countries. Our neighbourhood consists of Afghanistan, Pakistan, Tibet (should I mention it), Nepal, Burma, and Ceylon. I challenge the Foreign Minister to name a single country which is more friendly to us than to China. On the contrary quite a few of these are great friends of China whereas no one can be reckoned as such on our side. If, in spite of this, there are persons who boast of India's success in foreign affairs the least that can be said about them is that they have nothing to do with facts. The party now in government has forgotten the very first resolution on foreign policy passed by it in 1918 or 1919. I do not know who drafted it, but the style indicates the hand of Gandhiji in it. It was a small resolution. Later, Congress resolutions tended to be lengthy. It said that Independent India would take the greatest care about relations with neighbouring nations. My accusation is that India's foreign policy has been either indifferent to them or has tried to play big in respect of them, or it has set bad examples before them. Of bad examples I shall give one instance. Just as India's government has been split into two camps, some of the neighbouring governments also have thought it to be an easy way of getting aid from both sides and have split themselves into two halves, one bending towards the U.S.A. and the other towards U.S.S.R.

English, the language of India's foreign policy, is also a great deal to blame. I have been listenining to the Foreign Minister for the past 15 days or so. He knows a little English, but the way he uses the verb "disapprove" for what he himself calls Chinese "invasion" sets me worrying. I do not think that he is using these words in a calculated way, nor that he is a schizophrenic. On the one hand, he seems to realize that China has invaded India, on the other he feels that it is only a ordinary quarrel of which he merely disapproves. This is how his words can be analysed. Ignorant use of the English language is a bane of our foreign policy. We do not comprehend or use foreign words properly. When our Representative speaks English in the U.N meetings the British and American audience appreciate the parrot's eloquence but the latter produces no effect. While the Soviet delegates speak from their bowels and breasts our men speak only from their throats. Any

one desiring to change India's foreign policy must change its medium first.

I now revert to the two issues on which we are dependent on others, namely Pakistan and external aid. We cannot have an independent foreign policy so long as we are dependent on America and Russia on these two counts.

As regards Pakistan our first mistake is not distinguishing between the people of Pakistan and its government. The Pakistan government is as degenerate as the Indian counterpart, but I would like to see the people of India develop a deep and friendly attitude towards the people of Pakistan (*Interruptions*)

One Hon'ble Member : What a comparison ! Are you proud of saying so ?

R. Lohia : I can be proud about nothing. But you who have. . . .

Speaker : Please do not pay any attention to them. Speak to me.

R. Lohia : I am speaking to you.

One Hon'ble Member : Do you have enough self-respect while saying so ?

R. Lohia : They talk of self-respect after having lost 18 thousand square miles of our land. Has it ever occured to those who divided India that it can be united, too ?

Speaker : I would request Doctor Sahib to fling all his attacks on me. I am ready to tolerate them. Kindly do not pay attention to others.

R. Lohia : But I have to say something when they start poking in.

Speaker : You should ignore them and continue your speech.

R. Lohia : The question of Kashmir is often brought in, in this connection. There cannot be any solution of this problem by trying to negotiate on isolated issues like Canal waters. Even if the whole of Kashmir is given away to Pakistan that will not bring the conflict to an end. Some other quarel will crop up. There only can be a total approach to the problem of Indo-Pak relations, and to my mind there is no other solution than that of forming a confederation. Now, if I ask you to strive for such a goal I can anticipate the reactions. They will call me mad or utopian. How anyone think of such a thing when Pakistan is doing everything

possible to help China against us, I can only. . . .

Shyamlal Saraf : How can that be. . . . ?

R. Lohia : Try to dream a little, and you will know it can be done. You have lost the faculty of dreaming. The idea of unified India was there in the very resolution of the Government party which accepted the country's partitioning. The resoultion brought forward by the Hon'ble Foreign Minister to acquisece in partition also contained the idea of a single India from Kashmir to Kanya Kumari and to the farthest east—the India that was imprinted on our minds and hearts all along and whose image we were accustomed to worship. I am thus reminding the Congress members that the same resolution which accepted India's partition also mentioned the concept of a United India. It is a matter of sincere regret that the image has been wiped out of the hearts of Congressmen. That image must be revived now.

Shyamlal Saraf : Mr. Speaker, I may be allowed to put a question. A great leader is speaking and proposing the unification of India and Pakistan. Will he explain to us how this could be feasible ? For if the unification takes place all of us would be happy.

Mr. Speaker : Now, I don't have time enough to give to Doctor Sahib for explaining the details of his scheme.

R. Lohia : They cannot even think it feasible, because they have ceased to dream. After all, how did Pakistan come into existence ? Some people dreamt about it in England, so far away. True, it was a bad dream but some people dreamt it, and then Mr. Jinnah and the Muslim League also dreamt about it and ultimately the dream materialized. Our own minds seem to be working in a reverse fashion. When someone holds out the dream we turn our eyes and say, No, we cannot think of it. . .

Speaker : When you talk dreams, everyone in the House starts dreaming.

R. Lohia : Of dreams. . . (*Interruptions*)

Speaker : Order, order.

R. Lohia : There are people here who have been trained to be immersed in the existing order so much that they cannot dream, behave in a certain way. If such people existed always, India could not have been free. An Englishman would have sat now in your place presiding over a subject assembly. We attained freedom because we dreamt of it. I am today dreaming of united India and

India shall be one some day. The confederation will be a first step towards that, when we can talk six hundred million, *albeit* with humility and not with boasting as the Chinese do. In the event of a confederation taking shape every question may be considered anew; for instance, whether Kashmir would be included in India or in Pakistan or remain separate, and similarly the problem of two or óne Bengal.

I want this House and specially the Prime Minister to be careful while speaking on these matters. The other day I was worried to learn that while the Prime Minister disclosed the name of the Muslim spy, he was hesitant to give the name of the other spy Sharma, which was disclosed only a day later. Such may prove disastrous to us. A spy is neither a Muslim nor a Hindu. A person who goes against his country for money is a spy, and such persons are there in both countries.

In respect of foreign aid, we are like those beggars who start abusing when they don't get alms, and the white nations, whether U.S.A. or U.S.S.R., are like those donors who expect that the recipient. . . .

One Hon'ble Member : Should pray for it :

R. Lohia : Not only pray, but fall on his knees. It is high time for India to take courage and say that she won't receive any aid under such circumstances. As a matter of fact this view of aid from one country to another should not be there at all. Instead there should be a world Development Authority to which countries would donate according to ability and from which they take according to need. If we would make our foreign policy independent on these two counts, it is possible even now, although things have come to a perverse state through 15 years of wrong doing to strengthen the foreign policy. If the government, the Ministry of External Affairs and the embassies make it their concerted mission to projected the personal image of the Foreign Minister abroad, the nation never can be projected. If we want to build and project India's image internationally we shall have to work with entirely different motivations, those of the nation's integrity, well being and freedom. If you will allow me a minute's time I shall illustrate my point with an incident and finish. In 1957, when I was in the U.S.A. some Americans asked my opinion about their President, Mr. Truman. By that time a sort of identity had grown between me and my audience, and the barriers of nationality had been

weakened to that extent. My answer embarrassed them. Some of them pleaded with me to take Truman back with me to India upon which I said that I would accept the bargain only on condition that take my Prime Minister in exchange. I do not know what this remark of mine did to the image of the Prime Minister but it certainly presented well the image of India.

This reassured the Americans, who saw that India was also a democracy like themselves and had divergent opinions.

Our foreign policy should take interest in developing people to people relations; now there is only government to government relation. It is true that this has become a universal weakness of the twentieth century. There is now less intense relationship between people and people compared to the 19th century, but, at least, we should make an effort to establish better relations among the peoples of the world.

21

INDIA'S ARMED FORCES

RAMMANOHAR LOHIA

There was a time when, to people like me, the gun was a beastly thing and its holder a criminal or at least someone in whom intimate interest was not required. That was when the people did not possess their state. Today they do. Nevertheless, the gun is to me still a somewhat beastly thing. Only its holder, if he is a servant of the people, is awakening interest, rather an intimate interest.

To the hurt of both, the country's armed forces have not so far been studied by persons who were active in the struggle against foreign rule. True enough, they or such of them as became rulers inherited the armed forces raised by the foreign occupation. The nation simply accepted them as its own. Like everything else so inherited and accepted, a close inspection was not made. To multiply the inheritance was deemed to be enough. The present study of our armed forces is the first one ever made by a freedom-fighter who is not endowed with the comforting gift of two seprate minds and who is neither a back-looking chanter of old phrases nor a side-looking multiplier of things as they exist but who tries, to look forward to a people of happy prosperity. This happy people must also be a nation of strength, until there is a world order based on equality.

A myth continually chanted relates to the saga and tradition of a great army, precisely by those who not so long ago held it to ridicule as a body of rice-soldiers. It is not impossible to be partly

right on both occasions, when one expresses incompatible ideas. In this case that is not so. The Indian army has not been great, not in the last twelve hundred years, not certainly during the British occupation.

Why was this army not used in the European theatres during the war what began in 1939 ? It was used in North Africa, it was used in South and East Asia, but not in Europe. What was possible in 1914 and after was no longer possible in 1939 and after. The deciding reason may well have laid in the national awakening in between, which made the army independable in serious situations for its foreign controllers. Possibility exists that the second world war in its European forms gave rise to too many serious situations, in which a mulish discipline was not enough, nor individual valour of a few, but which called for a spontaneous and disciplined but also improvised valour of the many, if not of all. This the Indian army lacked not only in 1939 but also in 1914, and, if I may say so, in 1526 or 1527 and earlier ever after perhaps the ninth century. Fifteen twenty-six was when a Muslim king and general met the foreign conqueror disastrously, and fifteen twenty-seven, a Hindu prince and general equally disastrously. The concepts here used are exclusively native and not foreign. The study, therefore, relates to native armed forces.

Individual valour of a few does not make great or even a good armed force. It did not in Rajasthan of mediaeval times, although Todd has tried to obscure the truth. It did not under British rule, although a few Victoria Crosses have helped obscure the truth. The plain fact must be faced that there is no glorious tradition of a great army except perhaps in ancient India. After that there is a tradition of occasional chivalry and valour. To confuse a chivalrous tradition with the glory of an armed force is not only disturbing to the mind; it may destroy a nation.

Some rice-soldiers even may show valour and chivalry. They did it, both the rice-soldiers add the rice and whisky officers. That free India by and large mistook this valour for the glory of an armed force proves how unthinking and parroty the Indian mind has become, and also how incapable it has so far been of correcting happiness and greatness. I believe that a poor and diseased but numerous and weakened nation must in the act of seeking happiness also seek to be great. The Indian nation has sought to be neither, for it has in the last eighteen years been

under the rule of foolish parrots. One hopes the day would soon come, when no one lent his ear to the talk of a glorious armed tradition.

I am pursuing this argument for utilitarian reasons, and not for some academic or nice truth. If we need a strong armed force, we must go about it intelligently. To repeat established routine or even to multiply it would not give us a great or good force. What a comic and ridiculous relationship the param or simple Vir Chakra bears to the Victoria Cross, the V.C. or P.V C. of today to the V.C. of yesterday. Even the two minutes after eleven in the morning of 11th November, which is to Euro-America the armistice day of its first world war, have been sanctified as the two minutes after eleven of 30th January the Shaheed or martyrs' day of Free India. They have no relation whatever to the time of Gandhiji's or any other Indian's martyrdom. Only a routine of the armed forces had to be continued. "Beating the Retreat", a ceremony connected with 26th January celebrations, shows what a well-established and in parts pleasing circus the Indian army is for its masters right to the Christian tune of "Abide with me, O Lord". One would have expected the abandoning of this tune, or the addition of Hindu-Sikh and Muslim tunes, for the rulers have been parroty about secularism as well. All this pathetic continuation of a tradition, which may have been occasionally chivalrous but was grossly effete in the mass, is enough to turn the stomach. Why it has not turned the stomach of India's soldiers and younger officers is disturbing? There is need to revise, improve and create.

Some might be tempted to interrupt at this point that the argument no longer holds, for the country's armed forces have proved their mettle in the September, 1965 war againts Pakistan That anybody wants to judge India's armed forces on the touch stone of Pakistan shows how far judgment can get clouded. Pakistan is only one-fifth of India in population and its armed forces probably number no more than one-fourth of India's. Too much talk has been made of its America-provided weapons. However, high powered the weapons might have been and some of them have proved inadequate either because of lack of skill or incompatibility with the overall technical situation, India was at least thrice as strong in view particularly of its own production. Furthermore, a series of somewhat sedate battles do not constitute

a war. Except perhaps for three or four days, the battling itself was a little low-keyed. And yet something has been won by India, of which an objective assessment must be made.

If a nation and its armed forces loses the sense of proportion, they are fated to defect in a major encounter. That threat has shown itself. Gloating over such victories as were obtained and also over such that were imaginary has been of an indecent kind. An elephant might as well gloat over its victory against a buffalo, a she buffalo at that. If the conntry had a mature leadership, whatever it achieved on the battlefield would have formed a starting point for study and base for rebuilding. In any event, it would never have gloated. It would have maintained its own and the nation's sense of proportion on the morrow of the cease-fire. It would have offered a prayer and called for an anxious study. It would have congratulated the nation, for the lifting of an 18-year old curse in September, as battling took place for the first time on the invading enemy's own soil. The praper would have also included a hope that the people were perhaps entering a phase of confidenee in their own future and their politicians into a phase of national reconstruction more than the persuit of personal ambitions. And then the call for study would have come for correcting and creating, rather than the building of arches for a triumph that was yet to come.

One has only to take a total view of the encounters in September in order to discover how much there is to build. The thrust from Rajasthan into Sindh can only be described as a stupid if not a culpable adventure. It would seem to indicate that the political or military direction or perhaps both were hitting out like a bigger bear or chimpanzee against a smaller one without aim and design. The people were incidentally told lies after the cease fire both by the political and military command on territory lost and gained. When India was said to have lost about 250 square miles, and this was after a week of cease fire, Pakistan was already in occupation of over a 1,000 square miles and it still is against India's gain of round 800 square miles.

The elephant had nevertheless scored some decisive points against the buffalo, perhaps as much because of the bigger numbers and might as because of the individual valour displayed by the ranks and younger officers. Much more should have been done. One does not have to be a strategist in order to

understand that onle one of two designs were available. Either the incoming Pakistani divisions in the Chhamb-Jaurian sector should have been enveloped and decimated and, for this, if necessary, Sialkot should have been occupied. Or, the advance into Lahore should have been completed. Aside from being a military objective this could have been turned into part of an eminently satisfying political design. Neither of these objectives was sought except for those three or four days, after which there was a game of attrition or just blind hitting without design.

This proves conclusively that there was no political direction. The Government of India just did not exist between the 1st and 23rd September. It would be most surprising if any cabinet meetings were held to discuss and fix the bigger designs of military action. Some meetings might have been held to consider United Nations approaches. If there had been a cabinet or even a single leader with drive and design, the 23 days of September would have led to attainment of either of the two objectives indicated. Suspicion also arises that an overall military direction was absent in equal measure. Individual commanders perhaps showed ability in this or that operation The Chief of Staff and the Air Marshal might also have shown capability in limited operations. A full judgment must be withheld until the whole story is told. But such evidence as there is proves conclusively that a political direction did not exist and, perhaps because of that, the military direction was in places overcautious and others hitting out blindly and did not therefore possess a grand design.

One item of evidence should be enough. For three or four days between 6th and 9th of September, the people were told that their armed forces had already reached a suburb of Lahore, namely Mughalpura, that they had but the Radio Station out of action and that the entry into the city was only a matter of hours. These dispatches obviously arose out of briefings made in Delhi by defence or information ministry spokesmen, for no newspaper correspondent was with the advancing troops at this time. Then suddenly came a reversal of publicity. Most lamely and ludicrously, the people were told that the problems of feeding and administering Lahore would be so immense that an occupation was never contemplated.

It is quite clear that the first thrust yielded some results and as almost always, did not attain the full objective. The military

direetion developed cold feet and boggled at making a second thrust on its own, for the political direction was absent. It would perhaps be more right to say that both the political and military directions suffered from lack of policy, a grand design in relation to Pakistan and China. In fact, not to speak of policy decisions, no studies of alternative policies have been made, certainly not publicly, and so far as I know not even privately by the cabinet or the defence bureaus. And when the question is of moving hundreds and thousands of men and several thousand officers, public discussions over long years are required.

Is there a casual connection between the absence of an over-all policy and the lack of successive thrusts ? Yes, but the connection is not complete and exclusive. Some other items enter into the scene. Field Marshal Hindenburg once said that even Mussolini could not make anything but Italians out of Italians. That is so painfully true. But Italians were once Romans and the crack German legions did not always exist, for Germans were once rabble or mercenaries. A people has certain qualities as a people, no matter what their system or policies. But these qualities change with time but also a result of policy. The Indian people has certain qualities as a people, which must be taken note of in evaluating their armed forces, and some of which need to be used and some refashioned in order that the defence apparatus may become a suitable instrument.

The areas of this study must therefore include, however, sketchily : (1) the problem of successive thrusts or the will to win or die, (2) the meaning of nonviolence and the reach of its relevance, (3) what has so far been wrong with the armed forces with sample illustrations, (4) the people's state of mind and required change, (5) the designing of a comprehensive defence policy and its co-ordination with a grand design in world relations, (6) what concrete needs to be done in relation to defence preparedness and the capacity to strike effectively for objectives.

Everyone should know that the fitful battles of September and their casualties do not constitute a war. The Government asserts that less than three thousand have died. Even if the Government is lying three-fold, which does not seem to be easy, the number of deaths do not go upward of ten thousand. That war is indeed best which is won without a battle. But when it comes to a war that is forced and cannot be avoided, objectives

cannot be attained, if a people or its armed force is squeamish of dying. Three or ten thousand mean a medium-size disaster of typhoon or earth-quake and no more than half a dozen accidents of major stampede like in the Kumbh Mela

The objective to advance into Lahore may well have required greater sacrifices in men as might that of enveloping the Pakistani forces in Chhamb-Jaurian. The thrust towards Lahore was undertaken, so says the most plausible gossib, with one and half divisions in actual combat and an equal number in reserve. This was a patently stupid thing to do. Given the officer briefing after sixth September, the objective of Lahore was clear enough and the least that should have been done was the deployment of three divisions in actual combat and an equal number in reserve.

I am not talking of tactical errors that took place in relation to bridges over the Ichhogil canal or Derababa Nanak and similar other operational mishaps, delays or adventures. Such errors including those emanating from defeatist or treacherous designs take place in the best of forces or plans. The issue here is that of direction and its execution. As there is no authentic information of what actually happened, all that is left is objective collecting of available evidence and honest and painstaking guessing.

As an over-all political and military direction was absent, the means obviously did not suit the objective. Even if they had, a first thrust rarely attains the full objective. Regrouping of forces becomes necessary and a second or even a third thrust must be made after the shortest possible interval. This naturally means expenditure in men and material I suspect that a thousand or two dead induced loss of nerve.

Some random illustrations from European battling are indicated. A single objective has cost a hundred thousand dead. Soviet Russia lost around two crore people in the last war. Half a million bombed out persons in two nights' air raids over Berlin were cleared away and comforted inside of two days and German cities by the dozen had each to suffer over fifty thousand dead in a single day's or night's air raid. The Euro-American is tough and in comparison, we cannot take it at all. We just do not know what it is to war.

It is not as though death does not come our way. Premature death comes by the million, in starvation, disease or other forms.

But, the Indian mind accepts premature death enforced by social disordering and it boggles at death which is voluntary or semichosen. An additional argument may well be that deaths by the million prematurely and normally largely affect the poor and backward castes. Deaths in war affect also the middle and upper classes, for officers also die. But I am forestalling the argument, for its fuller statement must form part of examination of the people's mind.

It is indeed true that lack of an over-all policy in relation to Pakistan might have made losses in men appear senseless or excessive. Why should Lahore be occupied ? Nothing had been done in the past seventeen years to encourage rebellion in Pakistan among the people or armed forces. No designed approximation and commingling of Hindu and Muslim in India that is Bharat had been attempted much less even partly achieved so as to make possible the end of the country's partition. Again I am forestalling the argument, for its fuller statement will come while framing the grand policy regarding Pakistan.

Suffice it is to say that such a frame of mind is easily susceptible to pressures, more so foreign pressures emanating from powerful sources. Apart from immediate neighbours, America and Russia matter, and other countries need not be taken into account in this context. Indications are that both these countries put pressure on India each in its own way to go slow. Aside from blandishments of strength, they must have talked of peace which coincides well with the native and vapourous non-violence that still exists.

Peace and non-violence are different concepts. Much harm is done in mistaking one for the other. India's people and armed forces must clearly understand what these two concepts stand for. Peace as an ideal is good and invaluable but when the Euro-Americans and white Nations lecture to us on peace, we should know what that means. I should like to know what language adherents of peace in Russia or America would talk if their frontiers were invaded. It would also be interesting to know how they would act if a seemingly foreign encounter were wrapped up in an intimately native development. They talk of peace thousands of miles away, or peace that has to do with intimate relationships and principles of world order.

Relations between India and Pakistan are intimational alone

in form and are almost wholly national in content. Nevertheless, only a criminal would like to see these relations resolved through the instrument of war. But when a war is forced, only a criminal would not have made the policy and material arrangrment for it or bring it to a quick and fruitful end through lack of will. Power in war is essentially presence of will, the will to win or die. While a fuller statement would come, later, I must here define power in war, as first, will; secondly, industry and agriculture; thirdly, skill in warfare; fourthly, weapons. I need not say how much these priorities are messed up or reversed. How stupid it is when people call for similar fortifications on our side whenever they see or hear of some on Pakistan's. This betrays total lack of will and sense of proportion, and reveals that not even a faint glimmer of an objective exists.

What I have said so far has not been easy for me. I am not only a man of peace, but have been and would still like to be a man of non-violence. The desire for peace can go, as it does in America and Russia, with extreme preparations for war, while non-violence and war are incompatible Not only do I dislike war, but I see the absurdity of it most of all when India or Pakistan does it when anybody except the Russians or Americans wages it, then it would be a total tragedy. What weapons have we, and for how long? Russians or Americans, provided the other keeps quiet, can blast us and our cities out of existence inside of an hour, as of course in China, and they are almost always travelling in space. We are children playing with toys, not even modern toys, when India and Pakistan go to war. And yet the absurdity must be played out, when it is forced on us, for that would not yet be a total tragedy, and it is still possible to weave a design into it.

Non-violence is at present a farce. It has been a farce all the eighteen years since Gandhiji's death. Governmental Gandhism just does not exist, not a fraction of measure in which governmental Marxism does. Some constructive workers and seeming saints have kept up a pretence of non-violence, as much because of the two minds in almost every Indian as because of their earlier association with Gandhiji. But this pretence was totally nakedly exposed in September. Then who had advocated unilateral disarmament and sent messenger-boys to America and Russia blessed the battling or advancing armies. This was not just a

falling off from an ideal. This was not just a case of a shadow falling between the image and the reality. It was two images, both co-existing unashamedly, one of unilateral disarmament and the other of war. The Indian mind has come to consist of two opposite taps, either turning on or off at convenience. Not to talk of unilateralists, there has not been in all the twenty-three days of September a single war-resister in this land of Gandhiji and non-violence.

It should have been obvious to all foreign followers of Gandhiji, as it has long been to native practioners of civil disobedience against internal tyranny, that approved Gandhism has been sold out to Government of the days in every conceivable way. Whatever was left of it through the slow killing of eighteen years committed suicide in September. Nevertheless. that does not absolve heretics from the duty to discover if non-violence has still any relevance.

There was only one chance for non-violence. That was on the attainment of independence or immediately after, when India might have disbanded her armed forces. Today there is none. I wonder if this chance really existed eighteen years ago, even in theory. Mr. Bertrand Russell finds it easy to polarise rice and tractors against tanks and war. His country possesses both butter and guns, for he and his countrymen over eight centuries anyway been in possessions of a state, a native state. Precisely during that period. Indians have not possessed a state. They link up their statelessness with their poverty, which is as much an objective as a felt truth. They must have a state. In fact, all Afro-Asians and South Americans need statehood. That is not only an emotional need. That is a physical need, for without it they slip back into poverty and sloth.

Statehood so far all the world over has rested on armed forces. Incidentally, in the absence of statehood, India's international relationships have been unnatural for ten centuries now. Nature is bound to assert itself. Whatever has been unnatural with regard to Tibet and similar areas is bound to be corrected, if India keeps gaining in statehood. But the problem of non-violence remains, the absurdity of war in these areas of weak statehood and its total tragedy for America and Russia. In this formulation perhaps lies the solution.

The burden of non-violence lies not in the areas of absurdity,

but in those of tragedy. These areas of tragedy have both the ricc and the tanks, the champagne and the missiles. They alone can dacide what shall prevail, violence or non-violence. But, the areas of absurdity can lend a helping hand. They can decide to submit to a new international dimension, which does not yet exist but they may be created through the joint will of all mankind. That can alone be a world parliament, not a united nations of governments, but a parliament elected by all men. Problems such as those of big and small populations can be solved through regional groupings and weightages. Once this world parliament comes into being, no matter that its decisions may be wrong or unpalatable, possibility emerges that they will not be contested militarily.

If the areas of tragedy strove for non-violence and the areas of absurdity supported them with their endeavours for a world parliament, a world order may yet emerge. Untill then, men of non-violence must suspend their faith for the time being in the areas of weak and emerging statehood. Any other programme will lead to cant, as it has over the past eighteen years.

Such evidence as their is, for cabinet ministry have spoken of the need for atomic explosion for peace, goes to show that the India Government is engaged on what is known in America as the Project Gnome or Ploughshare. This is an atomic blast for peaceful purposes, such as tunnelling. Such an effort indeed calls for greater sophistication than an atomic blast for war. But an atomic blast is an atomic blast, whether for war or peace, and if one comes, the other becomes available. To keep talking away of nuclear catastrophes while preparing for them, is sheer cant or, at best, the co-existence of two minds in a single brain. That does not solve problems. Incidentally, members of parliament and younger officers in the armed forces must take greater interest in science and its slow progress in the country. The project Gnome may be coming to a successful end, but one sparrow does not make the summer.

With the belief in international non-violence suspended for the time being, but because of its impregnating effects, with the quest for peace made honest and genuine, this study of the country's armed forces must continue. A first requirement is widespread information of what has so far gone wrong, in order that the future may not repeat past mistakes. This is not as though one is

morbidly interested in an autopsy; the patient is recovering. This recovery will be aided by a full knowledge of the past. Not to have published General Brook-Henderson's report on the Urvasiam (Uttar Purva Simanta Anchal) debacle was always an error. Today it is an offence, for the country's military pride has been somewhat restored. Concealment of diseases beyond a certain point poisons the system like a festering sore under health an unhealthy skin. To get the poison out of the system. Brocke-Henderson's and similar reports must be published. Such reports should not be turned into a hole and corner affair of the top brass hat. They must be made available for the entire people and their soldiery, in particular, the younger officers.

I told Parliament twice about a circular asking unit commanders in Urvasiam to evacuate in the event of imminent fall and also tried unsuccessfully to raise a question about it. All that the Government did was to main a shamed silence. If there was such a circular the General responsible should have been court martialled and severest penalty meted. The responsibility went higher up probably into the political leadership.

When faced with danger, an innate urge resides with human breast to run away. If this urge is reinforced by command to leave in a situation of imminent fall, that amounts to a directive of cowardice or, to suit some tastes, a pacifist refusal to use arms after bearing them. Even to uncover the name of the leader or general responsible for this circular would be a service to the army and its future. I have on the other hand heard of a valourous in subordination in Ladakh, which almost wholly stopped the advance of Chinese armies there. The name of this brigadier should be inscribed on a roll of honour, although a hard and fast rule of when insubordination is a duty would be difficult to lay down.

Losses in men through this refusal to battle in Urvasiam were probably higher than would otherwise have been the case. The brigade in Se La was so well-fortified and equipped with food and munitions that it could have easily stayed there for a period of three to four months and with reinforcements would have bottled up the Chinese troops. Why it had to run away and die in large numbers into the jungles for because of Chinese attacks must now be told. At Bomdi la the evacuation took place even befor a single Chinese soldier was sighted, because it was dark and the evacuees

heard a thunder of shooting and explosions. A Walong the Chinese came through a road of snow earlier declared impassable by Indian command. Ever so, if they had held on large reinforcements had reached Dibrugarh. The supply of drinking water at the aerodrome proved insufficient and it was made available around midnight not by the civil or military administration but by popular relief agencies.

Nothing more mecabre has taken place in all history than the return of weapons by the Chinese to the Indian after the October 1962 War. I have heard accounts of two such ceremonies directly from the officers involved. The Chinese said, "You had the better weapons. you had the better marksmanship you had more men, but why you fled was a breakdown of morale of leadership. Anyway take these weapons you would need them." They did not specify what these occasions could be, although I believe that they were right about weapons and marksmanship and the numbers. At another ceremony, they wanted our officers to rest awhile and later dine, for, as they said, Indian men were so delicate that what was done in China by women such as stretcher-bearing easily tired them out. No victories were won by China, India lost against herself for something inside had snapped.

It must not be forgotten that whatever valour India's army showed under British rule was oftener against inferior forces of Persia, Ethiopia or China and in all events, including those of Europe of mountain-sniping, was the result of being backed by a King or Queen and industry and officers from Britain and their feudal imperialist discipline. The queen has now been replaced by the people and their president. Behind the army stands not British but Indian industry, a comparatively inadequate prop. The old discipline is gone, and so much the better. Where the people with such industry as they possess alone stand behind our armed forces, only a democratic discipline is possible. So much therefore depends on the quality of officers.

I suspect that the earliest batch of officers recruited in free India contained elements of upper classes, which thought that the land of non-violence needed an army largely for freedom-parades. Whatever I have heard of deeds of junior officers, commissioned and non-commissioned in September, 1965, has reassured me. That type of recruitment of the uniform-gladdened nitwit seems to be over, I hope finally. But, the top brass still talks English with

a Sandhurst fluency and its knife and fork manners make a number of native-trained officers but inferior. Khadakwasla and Dehra Dun are not such good academies from another point of view as well, for they are just as expensive as West Point, if not more, although the people's standard of living in America is ten times higher. Only through a living relationship with its people can an armed force gain striking power.

Serious discussions are being held in Switzerland and elsewhere on the most efficient structuring of a modern armed force. It is being seriously contended that food and uniform of everybody from the general to common soldier must be the same. Skill in this craft and courage and leadership are enough to distinguish the officer from the soldier. Such a state of affairs may actually take long to arrive in this country, although the need here is greater and, if the younger officers so desire, can perhaps be earlier achieved. Among other necessary changes, it would be worthwhile to open promotions right up to the Generalship to the ranks and, therefore, the English language must go here and now. The highest echelons are today reserved to the products of military academies. In their own interest, these officers should be ready to share them with the ranks, only criterion being the degree of skill, courage and leadership. How much talent is being burnt out today because of old routine of the dead weight of manners or accent !

The soldier and his officer are comrades in battle and therefore also in living. The ordinary Indian soldier received the pay of a hundred rupees a day for sometime after he reached Congo, but has since been cut down to less than five rupees a day. The officer must have suffered likewise. This is after all a national suffering, a slave of the nation as a whole, which is poor at home and must therefore reflect its poverty abroad. The Defence Minister told straight lies in answering my questions on Congo salaries. Mistaken interpretation of parliamentary procedures prevented me from making a fuller exposure.

The country is poor. It cannot pay high salaries. I hate to have to ask for higher pays in any sphere; I prefer to ask for lowering of upper class expenses. But what hits me, as it should anybody, is the enormous disparity. There is much griping in our army on this score. If I make mistakes in comparing some Pakistan and Indian salaries, I may be permitted to plead that I

have made every effort to check and re-check and that the information lies scattered in a jungle of weedy growth. While the Indian soidier starts at Rs. 55 a month, the Pakistani does at Rs. 78, the Indian subedar starts at Rs. 173 a month the Pakistani at Rs. 250. Officers in both armies are paid almost equally. Captains in both armies start at around Rs. 700 a month and Majors at Rs. 1000 in India and Rs. 1100 in Pakistan. The disparity in both armies is great; it is greater in the Indian. The little man is really little, very little, in this part of the world.

When comparisons are made with incomes or expenditures of big business or the top bureaucracy and ministers, the situation is dismaying. All or most zest is taken out of life. Furthermore, these luxury expenses patterned on Euro-America leave little for investment in agriculture and industry. Appeals to fight on empty stomachs become the order of the day. No people or army ever warred on an empty stomach. Equalitarianism is therefore necessary for many reasons. It is necessary in order to feed the people and improve industry. It is more so necessary for making the armed forces, officers and soldiers alike, a fit instrument of the national interest and world order.

II

Every armed force must make maps for all eventualities. So did the Indian for the event that Pakistan should march into Chamb-Jaurian. These maps were made around 1950. One possible defence was a countermove towards Lahore and Sialkot. An impression has been given as though such a counter-move was made on the spur of the moment, an action flowing out of the lion's heart of the prime or the defence mintster. Such spontaneity is not possible in modern wars. What is possible is exercise of varying degrees of will, from capitutation to uttermost resistance. All that can be said is that the will to capitulate was not there in September, 1965, but most assuredly the will to win was also not present. Furthermore, the maps had called for the making of a road, presumably called the Madhwapur road, which would have enabled India to entrap the Pakistan forces. Why this road was not made is a mystery that must be unravelled,

Not all maps are put into operation. But they must all be ready. Tens of thousands of staff officers both American and Russian must be at this work. They have to map for all the world. A country like India must at least map for its immediate frontiers. Whether China will invade our northern frontiers again cannot be answered for a certainty, but no General Staff worth the name would refuse to provide for it. Plans would most certainly be drawn up in such an event for counter-move into Tibet so as to effect junction with the Khampa rebels. The Dalai Lama should under no circumstances be kept diddling.

So long as the world does not cease to be naughty, plans must be made for all events That is not to say that openings for conciliation should not be exploited. Any defence establishment must therefore strive in three different directions. As part of the whole state, it must subject itself to the general drive for world parliament and order. Secondly it should map for all ugly contingencies. Thirdiy, it must assist in conciliation among states consistent with freedom and equality.

A truly national defence establishment would have to come into friction with its own people. Occasions of friction are nevertheless not rare, more so in poor and weak countries. Precisely in such countries is there need for revolutionary growth, but no matter what the dominant ideology may be, the people and their government often differ in the outlook. They clash and government's desire to use armed forces against its own people becomes irresistible. Except norms and hortations and the ultimate sanction of overthrow, no formula has been devised to regulate this aspect of the relationship between a people and its government. The armed forces are trained to obey. And yet there is the plain duty to insubbordination, both when a superior officer is chicken-hearted against an invader and when he orders brutal suppression of his own people. In the event that the people has not been indulging in assasination or armed overthrow of the government, armed forces have a duty to think before they act. The less friction there is between a defence establishment and its people, the more effective would it be against an invader.

Another area where the behaviour of the defence establishment needs drastically to be revised is the cantonment. Whether or not the cantonment is a specifically Indo-British institution of slavery, it has little in common with the garrison of modern European

countries. Almost a crore, or around one fiftieth, of the population lives in cantonments. Its rights of responsible government are severely curtailed. Its mayor or city Chief is necessarily a military officer. Its city council is half-nominated. Even so, the council's serutiny over the budget is limited. Such a denial or restriction of municipal government is indefensible. In far too many areas of our public life, does bureaucratic nomination make mockery of elective responsibility. Equally damaging is the strain imposed on the relationship between the population in a cantonment and the armed forces in particular, officers. Brigadiers are known to have slapped municipal councillors. Such a state of affairs impairs the fighting quality of a force against a foreigner.

What I saw of Intelligence in an Urvasiam town after the 1962 invasion by China beggars all description. The worst hovels were pointed out to me as homes of our Intelligence men. They were the porters that carried loads into Tibet. What these porters gathered during their journeys was all the intelligence on which our army moved. Nothing could have been more scandalous. As far back as two thousand three hundred years ago, India had known better. A whole network of preachers, informers garbed as reformers, orators, provccateurs and simple spies all over the world, or that part which concerned us, was envisaged. Mataharis too, were very much on the scene. Some bore the name poison-girls, which was literally true, and they were required to be famed beauties. Homely types must also have been used for requisite purpose. The elegant and charming title of city-bride-belonged to just one, whose house in the capital became the gathering place of prince and ambassador and which was protected against search. What information did such city-brides gather on their foreign travels !

Between that charming and ancient strength and the present intelegance of weak misery is cast that ever-lengthening-shadow of virginity. What are the mysterious processes through which the present day Indian has acquired his dirty worship of that little film of skin. Such a worship, whatever else it may be, is wholly destructive of a fighting force. One can either ask for virgins or effective armed forces, male and female, in a nation: one cannot have both. There are a hundred and one jobs which only women can do, and highly gifted or beautiful women, quite often behind the enemy lines. Then, the problem of war-widows is there. What burden would be taken off the mind of the soldier, if he were

assured that his widow with the children, if any would receive additionally affectionate attention of gallants. This brings us to the problem of state of mind of the people. Weat there is in the mind will reflect itself in the armed force. No matter what weapons and training and descipline, the essential base for all else is the mind of the people.

The people's mind in relation to defence is essentially a problem of history. If India is the most frequently invaded country in the world, what are the reasons ? A hitch arises as soon as the question is framed. No historian so far as I know has framed the question so. Some might have done it in order to give it a religious colouring, to run down one religious group against another. The point however is that the people of this country have been invaded again and again, more often than any other people of this earth and perhaps also ruled over a longer period by foreigners. Not only has no historian framed the question in this manner, but no historian on the basis of such study of history as there exists in the country today would accept it or assist in answering it. Then, there is the problem of vainglory and false self-respect. Much painstaking and brilliant effort will have to go into it before the people and their armed forces realise that this question and its answer will contribute to their health.

Historicism in this country has been essentially foreign. With the invador came chroniclers of events of scholars of history. This happened with the Afghans, Mughals and the British and in addition were Arab scholars and all kinds of European missionaries We may for the time being leave out of account such history as is contained in the Mahabharat and the Purans and other ancient books. The history that the scholarly person studies today and the average Indian knows beings with the end of the 12th century after Christ. Actually, it ought to begin with the disintegration of the Kanoj empire, some 500 years earlier. That would give a better under standing of the 700 years, which form the body of Indian historicism.

Foreign scholars and chroniclers were not interested in the base of things. They did not obviously have the native's eye or his aggrived heart. At the same time, they did not posses a human perspective. If they had, they would have brought to bear on their task one human being's sympathy in the shame and misery of another. As foreign scholars or chroniclers, they have largely been justifiers of their own nation's acts or gatherers of marvels and marginal phenomena. Even if some of them have been filled

with the milk of human kindness, it is of the wrong kind and a little too much. Not much understanding develops out of strings accusation, for the victim in that case is only an object in a laboratory. The invador has assaulted. The victim has suffered. This kind of history is just as meaning less as the other one that has woven into the last 700 years a design.

A number of hurdles must be removed. There is no such thing as a Muslim invasion of India or a Muslim period. There is an Afghan invasion, Mughal invasion and Irani invasion, the British invasion and similar other invasions. Even if one were to group together some of these invasions because of the faith of the conqueror, the essential point of our history is successive succumbing of the native to the foreign. It is precisely here that historicism in the country has been turned upside down. What is actually the succumbing of the native to the foreign is interpreted as assimilation of the foreign the native. Nowhere else, in the world have international playboys of history been so much at work. The wonderous thing is that no native historian has seen through this game.

With this theory of assimilation has gone the theory of renaissance. First, some marvellous capacity of the people to absorb and assimilate conquerors and to change them into natives has been detected. Secondly, each time that this happens, a flowering of culture and rebirth takes place. Thirdly, such emotionally charged and pleasantly flavoured concepts as "synthesis" and "unity in diversity" becomes peerless features of our people and the historians stock-in-trade.

These international playboys of history and their native carrion, for there has been no Indian historian yet, forget to consider just on point. Would all this end somewhere or would it be an interminable process. of assimilation, rebirth and synthesis. In that case India becomes a historical laboratory of unending invasions. If each time there is an assimilation and a rebirth, why boggle at it. Again, why is the rebirth each time some so weak that it is unable to withstand the new assault.

The plain fact is that what goes by the name of synthesis as a feature of our history is not actually so. Synthesis is the coming together of that which has been freely chosen in the new with the old that exists. If every compulsory joining together of the new with the old were called synthesis, there would be no difference between imposition and acceptance or choice. In a

similar way, rebirth takes place internally and is not and should not be the result of outside action. An outside action such as Commodore Perry's knocking at the gates of Japan may sometimes act as an impetus. But the renewal has to take place within, througth native forces, of native design and with native materials and resources.

On this reading of Indian history, there has yet been no rensissanee in the past 700 years. I would not be too categorical about the phase that has started with Mahatma Gandhi. Its violent arrest has made me somewhat suspicious. But, the phase has not yet run out its course and the possibilities are still there. To anyone who watches devotedly this growing plant and wishes to nurture it, some facts must be plain. We must kill completely our capacity to absorb and assimilate the conqueror. This unique virtue of India must now be considered a vice. I am now talking both as a nationalist and as a human. Only an international play boy of history can describe this vice of succumbing to foreign invasions as the virtue of assimilation, synthesis and rebirth. This great area of human misery both physical and mental must now be wiped out completely.

A tendency to facile explaining of defeat has been present in the mass mind and also in the writing of history. The enemy has superior weapons. He practises deceit. He is better organized in the exercise of cruelty, from Ghazni to Mao Tse-tung. The explanation is uniform. The accent is always on the enemy, his superiority in weapons, deceit or cruelty. This would turn the Indian people into loam waiting to be cast into any mould. When would the people and their historian begin to think in terms of their own weaknesses or disease, which make them comparatively ineffective against the foe, No people so numerous as the Indian could ever have succumbed to a conqueror because of what the enemy had. The people suffered defeat because of what they did not have. Something has been lacking in our people all these 700 years and in fact, for 500 years earlier. It is that lack which must be investigated. I have investigated it and come to the conclusion that the moment of history is perhaps come when it can be removed.

A widely held error must be put out of the way. When talking of our own weaknesses, attention is at once focussed on disunity or treachery. It is always the Jai Chand or Mir Zafars

that are supposed to be the villains of our history. They have existed everywhere and in every period. When the people have been filled with a purpose, it has known how to master and root out disunity or treachery. To do that, the people must be there. In the last 1200 years, the people has not existed, at least insofar as armed struggles for the mastery of the land are concerned. The disinterest of the people in the battles that went on around them has been phenomenonal. Text books of history are repleate with stories of this disinterest, to the playboy lyrical and to man ghastly. This disinterest seems now to be ending. A new chapter has started. Glib talks of disunity on the top rather than disinterest of the people may close this chapter abruptly.

Let every school boy know that not disunity among princes but the disinterest of the people has given successes to the conqueror. The interest of the people is therefore of paramount importance. Any present day orator who talks of disunity among parties and leaders, except in a secondary way, is contributing knowingly to defence weakness. He should talk of disinterest of the people. The greatest single item of this disinterest is without a doubt caste. Eradication of caste is therefore a military necessity. With caste develops disinterest of the people leads to defeat in war.

This disinterestedness of the people against the foreigner has gone alongside of a somewhat morbid interest in things and events inside the country. Not one person of Chinese descent has so far as I know been molested during all the period of Peking aggression. To ascribe it to a high state of culture or non-violence would be sheer nonsense. This culture has been dismally lacking between the Hindu and the Muslim, the users of one speech and another and the inhabitants of one state and another. These internal problems of religion, language and region and overarching them all the problem of caste have so deeply and spaciously filled up the Indian mind that there is comparatively little room left for the foreigner. The Pakistani is no foreigner. He is only another expression of the religions problem. If there can be such a thing as an inbred mind, the Indian people possess it.

The inbred mind is also curiously complacent. It thinks highly of itself. It considers the foreigner a barbarian or worse. It does not need Intelligence or spying to find out all about him, what he is doing and what he nas achieved. An immediate cause

of defeat in most battles has been lack of such Intelligence. The successful conqueror knows about all there is to know, of his vanquished foe and has a highly developed system of Intelligence and engineering. This lack of system of Intelligence drives from a curious complex of superiority. Internal problems close in on the mind. The inbred mind becomes fond of differences, thinks highly of them and discovers virtue in vice. The battle with this inbred mind as also against caste is a military necessity. The educational system of the country must of course take it up. But that moves slow. The general staff of armed forces may be expected to move quickly. If what I have said impresses them, they will know how to make use of it. They must move quickly to demolish the barriers and prejudices of caste, religion, language and region and therefore, the external should interest them more than the internal, not the internal, in relation to the mind, but the internal in relation to the country.

Immediate neighbours are a primary item of the outside world. Among these, China and that bit torn from our own limbs, Pakistan, have attracted armed attention The other neighbours should have been the closest friends of India. In times of glory around a 1000 years ago, we were all parts of one another even if free of each other. The country's foreign policy has been utterly shabby and stupid. It has dissipated assets such as Dalai Lama, U Nu and Ba Swe, Bishweshwar Koirala and probably also King Tribhuwan, Khan Abdul Gaffar Khan and acquired liabilities nearer at home such as Mr. Phizo and Sheikh Abdullah. Something has woefully lacked in the entire ideation of foreign policy. I have been told that the King of a neighbouring country wanted anxiously to hand over defence and foreign affairs of India and one story goes so far as to suggest that he desired complete integration like any other princely native territory and wanted nothing more than a pension for his family. History will hold the Indian Government culpable for the rejection of this offer. No more responsiibities than now would have devolved on us. In fact, the burden would have been somewhat lighter.

But then the story goes wrong right at the beginning, right at the time that Indla is free and two years after which China undergoes a Communist takeover. A dread of being called imperialist has hampered India to do the right thing at the right moment with the result that a bad and seemingly imperialist thing

has had to be done sometime later. Such pious humbugs who must necessarily turn into hoodlums at one time or another must never rule a country Freedom is precious. So is its defence. The world must become one. People must eat and live well and be happy. These are simple postulates on which foreign policy should be grounded. Never should a people or its government move out to attack freedom, however, misguided. But, a people must always be prepared to defend freedom particularly in its neighbourhood and when given a free choice to integrate it so as to form a larger whole.

The relationship with China and Pakistan has been haunted with a spectre, the spectre of a two front war. Men in the Government shiver before it, perhaps also those in the armed forces. Everything should of course be done to avoid a war, most of all a two-front war. But when everything conceivable has been done, one must look at the spectre squarely at the face.

The spectre of a two-front war has risen in relation to Germany. To her east, there was a first rate front. To her west, there was an equally first rate front. Even so, Germany fought these wars unrealistically and in ways she could perhaps have avoided and made a mistake in the opposite direction of poohpoohing the spectre. China is a second rate power. Pakistan is a fourth rate power. India too is a second rate power, although she sometimes thinks and acts as if she were a third rate one. Fighting on her own territory against a second rater and a fourth rater, even if in combination, she can be reasonably expected to act like a first rate power. Additionally, Tibet is not Chinese territory, perhaps also not Sinkiang. Pakistan is also a space borrowed from Hindustan, for how long depends very much on the humanity of India.

The tangled skein of Indo-Pakistan relationship must be unravelled. The first question to answer is whether there has been a change between then and now, then when Pakistan was created and now that she has been in existence for 18 years. One big change must be recorded. That change has taken place in the attitude of her active and more vociferous creators. Without going into all the reasons that brought Pakistan into being, what is of relevance here is the passive narrow-mindedness of the Hindu and the active fanaticism of the Muslim, the two primary forces that created Pakistan. But, the Muslims of Hindustan had reacted

rather curiously to the idea of Pakistan, when Mr. Jinnah was propagating it. The Muslims of those areas which now constitutes Pakistan were either opposed to it or not very warmly in support of it. It was the Muslims of what now constitutes India that is Bharat who shouted and rioted for Pakistan. This was only natural. Areas of Muslim majority could not be persuaded to fear rule by vote, which meant Hindu rule starkly and nakedly only to the areas of Muslim minorities.

50 to 60 million Muslims live in India that is Bharat. That is only a slightly lesser number than the 90 million Muslims of Pakistan. two-thirds to one Among the 90 million Muslims of Pakistan are the Muslim refugees from India, now grown to between 10 and 15 million. It was these Muslims of India that is Bharat and the Muslim refugees from Bharat, who strove actively for Pakistan. At that time, they were unable or unwilling to think. They just feared rule by vote which meant to them rule by Hindus. Mr. Jinnah lifted this fear up into realms of religious mysticism and the British helped him to their hearts content. He held out to them the prospect of a Pakistan, which would enable them to breathe the air of freedom. In their hypnosis, they did not stop to think. After 18 years, a situation has been created in which they are forced to be realistic. They are beginning to realise that Pakistan was created not in areas of Muslim minority, where precisely this breath of freedom was necessary.

Instead of providing them the breath of freedom. Pakistan has become a halter around their necks. Pakistan is very definitely a chief reason for such impairing as takes place in this country to their life, property and dignity. Aside from the fact that no bill of rights is ever fully realised, a bill of minority rights can truly prevail alone in an atmosphere of fearlessness, not alone fearlessness on the part of minority, but also the unwillingness of the majority to exercise fear. Such a bill of the minority rights, which actually means erasure of the words Hindu and Muslim outside the temple and the mosque, can prevail only when Pakistan and Bharat end into Hindustan. 18 years ago a Jinnah of evil prevailed. The time is now ripe for a good Jinnah to give thought and speech to what is potently latent in the minds of Bharat's Muslims.

This is not the time to bother about what Pakistan wants.

Did Jinnah ever bother about what Hindus wanted. He strove among his Muslims and although he could never have succeeded without the powerful support of British imperialism he certainly did not bother about the Hindus. What is needed today is the erasure as fully as possible of the separate identities of the Hindu and the Muslim in our political life. The closer the approximation between the Hindu and Muslim in Bharat, the nearer would be the last gurgle of Pakistan. The question, therefore, to answer is whether the passive narrow-mindedness of the Hindu has undergone or is capable of undergoing a change. Could some good Jinnah or Shankra among the Hindus make them aware of their golden chance, which they possess for the first time in thousand years of achieving equality among their citizens and through that a single state. The general staff must become deeply aware of this opportunity.

It would be good if China could recognize the good omen. For a thousand years, Hindustan has lain low. Its frontiers have become unnatural. It has been unable to defend the freedom of its neighbours. who have been absorved by China. This unnaturalness cannot exist for ever. The nature of land contours and history and the kinship of language and way of life will assert themselves. China is fighting a loosing battle, and the general staffs of both countries need to know it.

Examined on its own territory and in its own little form, Pakistan is highly unstable and soluble. One need only think of its minorities, Sindhi, Baluchi, Pathan, Bengali and the Bharati refugees. I am not here taking into account the 10 million Hindu minority of Pakistan, whose significance to a reconstitution of human welfare and Hindustan is difficult to describe or foretell. The other five minorities are of the utmost significance. One of them had ruled Pakistan at the time of its inception. Today it lies low in the dust. I am not here outlining actions in detail that have become necessary. All that I wish is that the people and their armed forces understand the healthier processes that are at work. When they have done so, millions and millions of them will think out in detail what each one of them has to do or groups of them. If the life, property and dignity of Muslims in Bharat is secure at a par with that of Hindus, the stage is set for a million-fold approach to Muslims of Pakistan in porticular to the refugees from Bharat.

The activity or passivity, openness or secrecy of Bharati support to the Pakistani minorities will very with the quiesence or eruption of tension between India and Pakistan. But, the support should always be there. No Government or general staff should again be foolish to live in the euphoria of a temporary pact. A silly question is often asked in relation to awakening of the minority impulse in Pakistan. Once the genii are raised, now will it be possible to still them in a re-constituted Hindustan. The answer lies in the question itself. These are not really minority impulses; they are human impulses that had once been used for the dismemberment of a country and its people and should now be used for its re-constitution through dissolving of the part that had broken away from it.

The negative factors need only be mentioned. First, Pakistan has acquired a ruling caste that has a vested interest in its continuance. Secondly, the Congress Party which has been in uninterrupted rule of India dreads the impact of any such large ideas on its own domination. Thirdly, the mind of the Hindu and the Muslim has not yet been shaken up enough. India's armed forces will do well to consider these nagative force.

I do not know when and how the final count will come but it must. If it comes through consent, it will begin with a loose confederation developing into a re-union with increas of mutual trust. If it comes through conflict, the re-union may be close right at the start. What is dissent to a democracy internally takes the form of conflict in international relationships. Let us imagine that Pakistan invades India again, whether in two months or five years is a secondary question. But, if the people, government and armed forces of the country have acted along lines of grand designs here outlined. Pakistan should dissolve as much through the instability of its own constituents as through the impact of armed encounter. Even while history seems to move on the wheel of conflict, the sage thing to do would be to move the wheel of consent simultaneously. Indoctrination of the armed forces must be complete. It is not enemy territory that they will treated nor an enemy people that they will assault or rape. What they must have in mind is a re-union of territory and people. Undoubtedly, only a criminal will think in terms of promoting an adventure. All that I have said is in relation to a counter move against possible Pakistani adventure.

Such grand designs cannot be conceived nor executed by weak hearts. Nobody should want self-immolation, least of all those who run a state. Their first and foremost desire should be to continue the state. If however, the continuance of the state is tied up with the risk of suffering and defeat and possibly of temporary disappearance, that risk must be taken. The desire to take such a risk will however depend on how far the Indian State is able to put through the egalitarian ideal, to awaken the interest of the people as a whole, to mow down barriers of inequality, particularly those of income, to invest in agriculture and industry particularly on what are today borders. I have not used the word "socialism," but that is what it means, not the socialism of hocus-pocus chant, but that of action and genuine understanding. It is undoubtedly true that a socialist revolution in India might by itself cause a tumbling of the present ruling caste in Pakistan and through that re-union.

The postures of America and Russia are indeed very relevant, but I have deliberately decided not to make mention of them. I have regretfully come to the conclusion that neither America nor Russia can purposely and systematically assist in any grand designs of foreign policy. They may do so only to the extent and at such time that it suits their national interest. India's foreign policy must, however, learn to pursue two purposes, one negative and the other positive. Negatively, it must learn not to rub either of them the wrong way, to observe normal courtesies, not to poke nose into affairs that do not belong to it and, above all, not to damage the nation's strength by strengthening inimical neighbours in the interest of some stupid leftist or rightist worlds illusions. Positively, it must persuade the Government to pursue policies of approximation and equality such would make the people of the world sit up and take note. Before this century runs out its course, wide and new explorations will be made by all humanity in both directions, the direction of cruelty and estrangement as well as that of sympathy and coming together. Men are hungering for the warmth of coming together through being equal to one another. This hunger is being brutally countered and is therefore eager and expectant when some new direction to still it is explored. Through such an exploration, would the people and Government of the country make a direct approach to the peoples of Russia and America as every other.

The general staff must carry out certain reforms in constituting our armed forces, some of which I indicate here by way of illustration. I once had the occasion to listen to the tale of compulsory military service in a European country of hard cold. The day began at 4 in the morning. It was filled up with arduous labour and exercises. In lands which are ordinarily regarded as those of alcohol and dissipation by Asians, the system of compulsory military service put in by a young citizen would become probably the last word in a Hardening I wonder when the Indian body is capable of such hardening. Long generation of under-feeding have probably reduced it to a condition which would not endure this system. Hardening of the body must nevertheless be attempted. Hours of work must be radically changed, for what prevails today is not European, but that aspect of Europe which was played out in the colonies. Training of Commanders and guerillas, combat teams of two consisting also of women, must be put through.

The present system of recruitment to the armed forces must be ended. Rice soldiers do not belong to the army of a free country. If all men are free, they must assume an equal share in the burden of defence. The ultimate sacrifice must be borne by them equally. To give up ones life in the defence of the motherland and when possible, of a world order is the ultimate sacrifice that a man can offer. This will not be possible, until recruitment to the armed forces is made obligatory on all sections of the population and not optional as at present. With the option to recruit, love of the country is an impelling force only if it is combined with economic need. If military service is made compulsory for a young man and perhaps also certain groups of young women and call-up by age groups in the event of war takes place, all sections of the population will suffer the ultimate sacrifice equally and I hope with such cheer as the people has never known before. When the sons of the seavenger and the Prime Minister face death equally, a new day will have dawned.

The constitution of Officers must undergo correspondence reforms. A large proportion of them will have to be trained inevitably at academies. What proportion this should be can be decided only after some principles are accepted. First, the country's military academies must be nationalised. Sandhurst and Woolwich Marionettes must not be allowed to run the army. The army is still officered in its high rungs by men trained in these British

academies. What is worse, a large section of the new group of Officers that is being trained in military academies situate in the country is a very pale and very effete copy of the original. If there was anything good in the model that was trained directly in Britain, that fades away with the copy that is being trained in India. A chief reason is perhaps the English language, which is the medium of these military academies, but does not live in the air around as it does in Britain. More hardening of a native type will also have to be worked out. Secondly, a considerable proportion of the Officers right up to the office of the Commanding Generals must come from the ranks. How this recruitment or throwing up will be done is a matter of details. Once the principle is decided that the ordinary soldier can rise up through his bravery or skill or a combination of both processes will not be difficult to work out. Whether the proportion of such Officers risen from the ranks should be ½ or ¾ of the entire body of Officers is again a matter capable of experimenting.

Action before the need for it is felt is not in our character. Armed forces, however, cannot be organised in that fashion. As they must map for all eventualities, they must also make material provision for them. The instance of para-doctors may be cited. After the 1961 invasion by China, the need for a large body of para-doctors able to provide elementary medical service was felt. The Medical Associations of the country. I understand, drew up schemes which would have given us a quarter million such para-doctors or even more. The schemes were soon pigeon-holed. Popular enthusiasm blew off and the schemes went into cold storage. The Government and its armed forces must not act in that fashion. They are not expected to act alone on tides of enthusiasm. They must act more rationally and calculatingly. If the people are soon awakened, they might ask for an account.

I would like to close the present study with a story that is one of the most valuable experiences of my life. We formed part of the underground resistance in 1942. The open rebellion of August had ended. We had some kind of a Central directorate trying to fan the embers into a new revolutionary out-break. The highest Indian Officer of what was then the Royal Indian Airforce was Mr. Majumdar, whom his chums called Jumbo, therefore, Jumbo Majumdar. He came to see us in our hideout. For two hours he sat completely relaxed in our company without the slightest anxiety

of what might happen to him, if he were discovered with us. He assured us of complete co-operation of the Indian section of the Airforce in the event of another revolutionary outbreak of the people. He gave us this assurance on behalf of the entire body of Indian Officers in the Airforce. He told us that the August rebellion had caught them unawares, which they were determined shall not happen again. Tall, handsome, solid, relaxed and how composed in his risky adventure Jumbo to me was the picture of healthy loyalty and he shall ever so remain. India's armed forces would do well to see in him their model. There has been so much continuance of gross in our public life that the meanings of loyalty and slavery are sometimes hard to distinguish. I do not know whether the integration of the Azad Hind army into the country's armed forces was made difficult because of the inability to distinguish these meanings. Jumbo Majumdar stays as my ideal and if I were running the country's armed forces and informing them with the grand purpose here indicated, I would make him their ideal too.

22

MY RESTLESSNESS AND THE REASONS FOR IT

RAMMANOHAR LOHIA

How foolish have I been in not trying to meet Rajaji whenever I was in Madras. This time it was a bare half an hour, for Rajaji had been ill, and even the short while that I was there I was occasionally cursing myself, but the affection that he showed and memories that he awakened were overwhelming.

Among my first encounters with Rajaji was a rapid fire repartee on a Congress Working Committee resolution, which had condemned the Congress Socialist Party and its talk of 'class struggle'. This was around 1984. Rajaji threatened me with that resolution, but of course with a smile and suavity of which he is a peerless master. I said that I did not care a tuppence for the Working Committee resolution, and to do Justice to myself I must say that I was only 24 at that time. Just as suave as before. Rajaji answered that he had expected me to swear in Russian currency and he was surprised that I still swore in British currency ! Before I could match wit with wit, he turned into a school boy and began asking me of roubles and kopecks and the rest of it. That is also a trick of the master, not to let the other fellow have a chance. That keen and alert mind continues. Thirty-three years later, as he is now turning ninety, he talked of not being misled by the porcupinish exterior of a certain person. He also talked of how some people are found of holding the mirror continuously to their own faces.

I wonder how I gave Rajaji the impression that I was so obviously restless. I am now-a-days relaxed, and was particularly so with him on that day. There must be an inner restlessness in me, and so I cannot say that Rajaji was entirely wrong. I am restless about the temper of our people, their laziness and their unconcern. I am also pessimistic but not dangerously; and there Rajaji made a mistake. I have learnt the duty of despair. I am resigned to fate, whether I might die tomorrow or ten years hence without seeing the government of my choice.

What disturbs me is our politics from the top, both the good one and the bad one. Beyond voting during an election when it comes along, the people want food, freedom and prosperity to fall from the heaven of some leader or party or combination of parties. Some of them occasionally indulge in some acts of disorder—not very presistent or systematic. I have nevertheless not lost my faith in non-violence.

The practice of non-violence has in recent years been presenting some difficulties to me. We just don't know how to move large masses of people into action. Some sections are sometimes moved, but that change does not occur in the mass. One of the reasons why this does not happen is the indolence of those engaged in politics—for which we seem to have no remedy. Some parties are supposed to be good organizationally. When one examines them closely, they too are the handiwork of a number of paid whole-timers, somewhat like clerks of a full-grown establishment. We socialists have no money. At some point or the other, we must have lost our capacity to handle money, native or foreign. But all this does not make me believe in violence. If anything, my theoretical faith in non-violence has been growing. Rajaji need have no worries on that account

How wonderful he was when he told me that the indiscipline of our people makes the practice of violence vastly dangerous, while non-violence, even in defeat, may not suffer very greatly from it. But that does not solve my problem, which is how to generate politics from below, how to make 20,000 or 30,000 activitists of my party move, or else how to get together a 100,000 activists of all parties or no party to change the politics of the country through persistent and day by day work as though it were their profession or at least a part-profession.

I must straighten the issue of Statism and Socialism. I have

sometimes said, as Rajaji often does, that socialism is slavery, but then I meant the socialism of the Congress Party which denies the government servant the right to associate with the political party of his choice, the Congress Party which permits a small coterie of people to multiply their wealth ten or twenty fold in twenty years and which keeps 90 per cent of the people in the morass of poverty of body and mind, the bog of famine and mindlessness. I am also somewhat anti-bureaucratic by temperament. I dont't like the civilization of amenities, double prices, expense accounts and the like. But I must make it clear that I do not like any expenditure beyond a certain limit also that of the capitalists and the free professions. I do not think that the answer to the Indian bog is incentive. Only 5 per cent of the population may be affected by such solutions as incentives or disincentives, Ninety-five per cent of the population or certainly 90 per cent live in a condition of stupor. They can be awakned only through a programme of "Equality through prosperity through equality."

Rajaji need have no worries about me. I am too old now to change my faith in non-violence or begin to organize violence. But he should have worries about me and millions of others like me on another score. We just do not know how to make our people work, whether for bread or for revolution. At the moment I would want to make them work for revolution, or perhaps I had better use the world 'change.' But that has been eluding us and, if may respectfully suggest to him, he must do some fresh thinking on how to move the mass of the people. I don't know whether the orange can recover a fresh rind or not, for he compared a keen mind within a failing body to a skinless orange, but this I know that the mind goes a long way and I devoutly hope that it does so with Rajaji.

My own journals *Jan* and *Mankind* are monthlies and that is why I am sending this price to Swarajya.

23

HINDI—HERE AND NOW

RAMMANOHAR LOHIA

Today, Hindi is a hand-maid of English, and of the government. A majority of the general masses and some very few among the men of influence are unhappy about the present situation. But the men who shape our daily lives—such persons working in the administration, in the realm of letters and thought, in the radio and in the press—all of these wittingly or unwittingly, or under some compulsion, contribute to making Hindi a subservient of English. In this action they have a protective armour. They may have donned this armour with noble intention but the result is the same.

The armour is beguilingly simple. 'Spread Hindi and develop Hindi' ! This two-fold exhortation has a powerful appeal. Right at the outset one is impressed by the seeming reasonableness of the appeal. After all, there are at least as many non-Hindi-speaking persons in the country as there are Hindi-speaking persons. Unless Hindi is spread throughout the country, how can it become the country's language ? At the same time. Hindi lacks the modernity possessed by some European language. So the emphasis on reforming and replenising the Hindi vocabulary and books is also readily gobbled up. But there is poison in both these 'constructive' pleas. Maybe, they who have injected this poison knew not what they were doing.

Sometimes one begins to hate the very word 'constructive' when it appears as an alternative to destructive'. Construction and

destruction are complementary roles. Any one of these is incomplete without the other. But while destruction without construction may result either in good or in evil, in accepting construction without destruction, I see nothing but evil.

SPREAD OF HINDI

What do we mean when we talk about the spread of Hindi in non-Hindi regions ? Statistics are always being cited to show the increasing number of students who have passed in Hindi in this or that examination of such and such sammelan in Kerala or Bengal. These figures have no meaning unless at the same time we are told about the increase in the number of students who have passed in English. In India today the issues of English and Hindi are interrelated.

The number of students taking English has been growing rapidly—far more rapidly than is the case with Hindi. For high school and college education, English is compulsory, while Hindi is optional. There can be no comparison between the systematic studies imparted by a regular school and the casual instruction given by the various sammelans. There is no sense in polling out that even though the number taking to English is increasing, the standard of English in the matter of grammar and pronunciation is going down. Truly, with my one year's experience of the Lok Sabha, I can say that 'Incorrect English' can certainly become the official language of the country—even though there may be difficulties in adopting it as our mother-tongue as many African States have done.

It cannot be gainsaid that Hindi is not modern—in the sense that not much modern knowledge is available in this language. The language has not yet been so equipped as to become a suitable vehicle for the purpose. I am not speaking about its potential. It's of the present state that I say this. In one sence it is the best language in the world. It has a larger vocabulary than that of any other language. But this vocabulary hasn't been chiselled to suit the requirements of modern knowledge. No doubt this work must be done. Let philologists and lexicographers do that job. Let us have all the necessary translations, and more and more works in Hindi. But all this by itself is insufficient. Howsoever hard we exert in this direction, success will continue to elude us. There is

another and more important—rather imperative—way of equipping the language.

Just as a child cannot learn to swim unless he plunges into the water and suffers a few duckings, and undeveloped language cannot develop unless put to use. Hindi must be put to use immediately and everywhere—for science and for law, in government and in public life. Maybe in the beginning it will waddle clumsily, and make mistakes. I can say however that the blunders committed in Hindi are likely to prove less damaging than those that are being committed in English today. But that is another matter. What I wish to emphasise here is that by actually using Hindi in their work, the men in government, the lecturers, the writers, the speakers, the scientists, etc., can contribute much more to its development, than the linguists or lexicographers can. It is through use that a language grows; not that a language is to be used after it has grown.

When these twin issues of spreading Hindi and developing Hindi are raised, the basic question of removing English is evaded. Let Hindi be popularised first; let it become developed first; only then can it be used in courts, in laboratories in universities, in government, etc.—that is the contention. But the trouble about it is that unless it is first used in these spheres, it will neither become popular nor can it develop. So the net result is that the issue is stalled.

THOSE WHO STALL

Of course, the conscience of those who stall it thus remains clear. For some, evasion of the issue means a guarantee of their livelihood. For others, it is an assurance that their present prosperity continues unimpaired. Without hesitation, I would call all these persons mercenaries in Hindi. Whatever their intentions, the outcome of their conduct is that English stays put with us for eternity, and Hindi is unable to spread, or develop, for ever. Meanwhile these Hindi merchants, posted in this department or that section, continue to ply their trade merrily.

Permit me a digression at this point. There is a very great draw-back in Hindi—in fact in all Indian languages. There is a surfeit of honey in them. Some words have become so linked up that in appreciation or criticism, extreme language becomes

unavoidable. There may be many reasons for this. One reason perhaps is the style of Hindi used by the *chaarans*—the court poets. Every *vani* (voice) is *amrit vani* (nectar-like voice), every *sandesh* (message) is an *amar sandesh*, and every *purush* (man) is a *maha purush* (great man) ! This style militates against logic and critical analysis and so against the truth. The advent of the *shair* and *ghazal* (of Urdu) made matters still worse.

VARIETY

Language is a vehicle. A vehicle's job is to carry loads without discrimination. That vehicle is best which serves all equally well—the pure as well as the base. I have been prompted to say this because some people have interpreted 'Banish English' as meaning 'Banish Anglicism.' It by 'Anglicism' they mean just artificiality and affectation, I have no objection to the interpretation. But if they mean thereby that ladies should not apply lipstic, or that there should be no ball-room dancing and just Bharat Natyam and Kathak, or that there should be no divorce, etc., I must point out that language should be a medium capable of expressing both the attitudes, or rather all attitudes, orthodox as well as heterodox.

Of course, I detest impurity. But opinions can vary as to what is pure and what is improve. Maybe, only one of these opinions is the correct one. As for example, it is not proper to ride a man-pulled rickshaw. And I think there can be no two opinions about this. It is also my view that the practice in the Hawaii Island of the United States to greet a stranger with a light kiss, or to start acquantances in that way, as quite right (the practice is now spreading to the rest of the United States and in practically all art assemblies). I feel that there ought to be no two opinions in this matter also. But I known that many good persons in this country would strongly disapprove of the idea. They ought to have an opportunity of holding that opinion. Therefore, even where in one's own mind one sees not the slightest scope for a difference of opinion, one ought to allow variegated views in most matters.

LUCID AND PRECISE

So Hindi should be such as can be availed of by all types of people. It should be lucid, colourful, capable of expressing subtle nuances of thought, and the same time precise, forceful and interesting. A developed language means nothing else. The question as to how many books a particular language has is a secondary question. If Hindi is made lucid enough and variegated enough for all subjects, and it will take time to have thousands of books in the language. When in the context of the need to banish English, people talk about the paucity of Hindi books, one feels amused, even angry. One wonders : are they fools or knaves ? If it were made compulsory for all college professors to translate one book each during the vacations, there would be with us a mountain of books in three months. The problem which would remain would be only of lucidity and preciseness. But this problem is not going to be solved by preparing technical terminologies and lexicons. The only solution is to start using the vehicle of Hindi immediately, and to make it bear all sorts of loads, and in all fields.

The question of Hindi and of other Indian languages does not depend on any extraneous factor. It is a question simply of resolve, just of decision. Public decisions are always political. Whether English is to go or to remain, whether Hindi is to come, and if so when—this is a question to be determined purely on the political plane. It has nothing to do with the question of literature, of terminology, or of any subjective argument. It is simply a question of wishing to do a thing. If the wish to banish English and adopt Hindi or Tamil becomes strong, even the dumb would start speaking. Everyone would speak and everything would be spoken.

ATTEMPT TO KILL

Nothing has been spared to kill this resolve. Let us survey the depressing situation in the coast lands. There are province where you can muster lakhs or even a crore to shout '*Hindi Murdabad*'. Maybe they don't mean it, and are made to say so because of some misconception. But no efforts are being made to remove this misconception. So the situation doesn't seem to

be changing. Even in those coastal States where the anti-Hindi atmosphere is not as vicious as it as in Tamilnad or Bengal, there is an attitude of indifference. There is not one amongst these States where a majority of the people are warm about having Hindi, or seem likely to become enthusiastic about it in the near future. Half of our population lives in these coastal provinces.

If this is the attitude here, the resolve to adopt Hindi may well be deemed shattered. They who in such a situation talk about developing Hindi to make it acceptable in the future are only fighting shy of facing the truth and are trying to imagine a spark in what is dead cold ash.

In Shivaji's durbar, things were different. Even Nataji Bose accepted Hindi. Our entire tradition, from Jayasi to Gandhi is there before us to show that the really great man in this coastal zone has accepted Hindi. The great Maratha and the great Bengali accepts Hindi. He even makes it his mother language. But the petty coastal—the petty Bengali and the petty Maratha—rejects it. I am not referring to the common man. The common man is never petty. Greatness and pettiness—both are attributes found essentially in the powerful men. In a democracy both these possibilities exist. For the men of influence, both the ways are open—towards greatness, towards pettiness.

It would be interesting to see why, in the matter of language, many powerful men in the coastal lands chose to tread the path of pettiness. Perhaps it has been the same in all matters. But in regard to language, it is undoubtedly so. The rulers have certainly been petty. In a relative way, all those too have been petty who have been connected with spheres of day-to-day activity like science and education. Greatness has been visible in traditional matters—like music, or dance. This difference can be an interesting subject for research. Whatever power an individual gathers in life, has been through the medium of some European language, mainly English. A direct contact has thus been established between the languages of the coastal States and English. After the province, it is the world; the nation is missing. The result is that the Indian doesn't become a real friend of the world—he is just a flirt. Having forgotten to look backward he is incapable of looking forward either. He can just throw glances sideways —at Europe, and imitate. He refuses to look back at old India and its unities. And he finds it troublesome to look ahead.

I have seen an all-India language and script used even in the Ikshwaku and Shaka capitals. These capitals were situated in the far south—on the banks of the Krishna. And that was more than 1,500 years ago. So what I have said about Bengal and Maharashtra applies more or less to Tamilnad and Andhra too.

THE TRADITION

What is Hindi ? It is the language born out of this all-India tradition. Just as we had Sanskrit at one time, or later Pali, or then some or other variant which enjoyed countrywide recognition. I do not propose to go into historical details here. Broadly speaking, Hindi may be regarded as the universally accepted *prakrit*, at a given time. This is its origin and this is its character. And in this basic character of the language lies an explanation of the ups and downs of its fate. This language has been current in the army cantonments. In the cantonments of the south it was described as Dakkini.

Now-a-days much discussion has been going on as to the form of Hindi. Some want it to be Sanskritised, others Arabicised. Some would like it to be colloquial and others would relish it mixed with a good measure of the idioms and usages of the coastal languages. That it should have so many shapes is a strong point with Hindi. Some or the other of these forms will come to acquire uniform acceptance. The government's pleasure can sometimes aid, and sometimes hamper, giving currency to its proper form.

I think it is foolish to fritter too much energy over this debate about its form, because in that case the question about our basic resolve recedes into the background. Let all these suggested varieties compete with one another. Whichever wons, it's fine with us. We have no objection. Our objection is to the suggestion that the *swoyamvar* will take place after the winner is decided. We say the *swayamvar* has already taken place. As to its form, we can only say : whatever the form, what harm is it to us ?.

THE PETTINESS

Let us return to the original question. In the matter of

language, the powerful in the coastal provinces are petty. But no less petty are the powerful in the midland provinces. If there were greatness here, matters would have been solved. Greateness can be of two kinds—either of superior strength or of superior understanding and humility. The important men in the midlands have been lacking in both kinds of greatness. There pettiness has been pettier than that of the coastal region, and so more galling.

When British rule ended, the question of language was a burning one. If the prominent men in these central States had the greatness of Shivaji or Subhash Bose, there would have been question of accepting or even contemplating to defer the adoption of Hindi and banishment of English. To fix the date-line of 1965 in the year 1950 seems to me the height of foolishness and extreme pettiness. The rulers at that time could very well see that with the passage of time, English could become more entrenched and the position of Hindi would go on weakening. They started swearing in the name of Hindi, but mentally pledged loyalty to English. The oaths in Hindi's name therefore became formal and superficial. In action, they did everything that violated the oath.

IMPLEMENTATION

Either there should have been no pledge to have Hindi as the country's Official Language, and if the pledge was taken, it ought to have been implemented immediately. What was the meaning of fixing a date-line ? Let us analyse why they did it. Two reasons were given. Number one, Hindi needs to be developed first. Number two, by publicity and propaganda, Hindi must be made acceptable to the coastal provinces. The first reason given meant that Hindi today was not developed, and after a certain time, when it became developed, it would be made the Official Language. Carefully seen, one would be able to see the dangerous snag in the argument. He who accepts that Hindi or any other Indian language is undeveloped today, and on that account cannot become the Official Language of the country, can at no time even in the future hope to free himself from the stranglehold of this argument.

Whether a language is developed or not is after all a relative question. When one says that Hindi is undeveloped, he means

undeveloped as compared to English, German, or Russian. Evidently, if the development of a language is to be measured in terms of the books it has or the technical terminology it has been able to evolve, by the time Hindi makes some progress, the other languages which already enjoy a great lead, will have gone farther ahead. Comparatively speaking, therefore, Hindi would be still undeveloped. Enemies of Hindi would thus be able to use, this specious argument against Hindi for all time to come, and Hindi's friends would feel stumped for an answer.

Does Hindi have any friends? At least they are not its friends who are commonly believed to be the votaries of Hindi. They are mercenaries out to make profits. From the various Hindi departments, they receive either money or prestige or both. All of them are supposed to be engaged in the task of developing Hindi. Directly or indirectly, they condemn those who want to make undeveloped Hindi the country's language right now. Whether Hindi should become the national language forthwith or after development is a matter related to government and its determination. The status as well as finances of these mercenaries of Hindi depend on the government which wants development first and installation only thereafter and not or those who stand for installation first and development afterwards.

A LANGUAGE'S GROWTH

Only by flinging one's weight about in the waters and droping and ducking, can one learn to swim. A language grows rich only with qurrency. So if Hindi asserts itself in the legislatures, in courts, in laboratories. In trade, in army centres etc., only then will it grow. Not before that.

The second argument about acceptance by the coastal provinces is even more dangerous. As time passes, its acceptablity in these provinces is dwindling. This is natural, because the knowledge of English, spurious though it be, is growing. Besides, it's difficult to climb, but easy to fall. Once you relax, it generally means hurtling down at accelerating speed. Those who have seen the Lok Sabha—where ordinally the question of accepting or rejecting Hindi is settled—can well realise that only a miracle can have Hindi accepted.

It is said that the Tamllians or the Bengalis are not ready to

accept Hindi. Who are these Tamilians and Bengalis ? They aren't any incorporeal beings fallen from the heavens ! Looking at the present Lok Sakha a majority of these are Congressmen. Some are Communists or DMK-ites. These Congressmen, these Communists and these DMK-ites are not willing to accept Hindi. Nor will they ever be ready, except, as I said, by a miracle. The Congressites are clever people. They blame others for their own sins. After all, who are these Tamilians and Bengalis who oppose Hindi. Aren't they Congressmen ? Why doesn't the Congress honestly implement its policy ? Why does it want to stick to office ? Why can it not carry out its policy even if it means some risk to its office, wholly or partly ? Communists also should not be allowed to get away with their part in the crime. They talk a lot about championing the people's language. But in practice they serve to promote subvervience to English.

A STALEMATE

The situation today is like a stalemate in chess. There is a stalemate in the matter of language today. Hindi will not become the country's language until and unless the coastal provinces abopt it. And there appears to be no probability of their adopting it. How is this stalemate to be broken ? There needs to be a new move. Only one move is conceivable.

Till now English has been opposed with Hindi. That has been past history, and that might be the future also. But in the present. the fact that the confrontatation is English *versus* Hindi. makes the coastal languages appear partisan to English. The nature of the confrontation needs to change. It should be English *versus* Indian Languages. They who shout that Hindi is the National Language or will become so in the future are unknowingly indulging in deception. The cry is either meaningless or harmful. The real issue is : how is English to go ?

As it is even in the two or three colleges Tamilinad where Tamil had been introduced as an alternative medium, no one takes the Tamil medium. English reigns supreme. Tamilians who are opposing Hindi today are in fact enemies of Tamil itself. But how to make them realise this ? The only way is to ask the coastal provinces to agree to the banishment of English and meanwhile let the States of the midlands be ready to accept any solution in

regard to language.

THE POSSIBILITIES

The possibilities are follows. Firstly, any of the coastal languages becomes the country's language. Secondly, the country accepts a multilingual arrangement. Thirdly, Hindi is accepted as the country's language, and there are reservations for persons from the coastal provinces. Fourthly, the provinces of the midlands decide to banish English immediately and completely, even if the coastal lands prefer to retain it. I do not see any other alternative. One of these four will have to be accepted.

Some people regard a multilingual centre or a non-Hindi centre as either loose or foolish. But as compared to an English centre, I would prefer passing through this 'loose' or 'foolish' phase. Maybe after this phase the coastal provinces will spontaneously accept a common language. And that common language can be only Hindi, none else. But those from the Hindi States ought not to say this.

All these questions depend on our will and resolve. I do not visualise any new resolve originating in the coastal provinces. A new resolve must stem from the midland zone. But the resolve should be such as does not provoke the people in the coastal regions and indeed inclines them to accept it. This resolve must be implemented with vigour after January 26, 1965. Let us not repeat the folly of fixing another date-line. Banish English, and banish it immediately. If English is to go, it will go not tommorrow, but today and now. After January 26, 1965, there should be no confusion about what is this today and now. The use of English anywhere in the midlands after this date is against the Constitution and so should be regarded as a crime and a sin. But the irony of it is that those guilty of this crime are in power and those who strive to defend the Constitution, or are exerting to remedy matters, have to suffer on that account.

It is useless to cite the Language Act. An enactment which violates the Constitution is illegal. The Constitution permits the use of English only in spheres specficially and serverally enumerated and aceepted by Parliament. The act often quoted in this context is illegal and unconstitutional. Neverthelesss they who have violated their pledge rule the country.

TWO SUGGESTIONS

Let the people of the midland States solemnly resolve that they will not allow English in any sphere. The resolution is not simple. Who will bell the cat? But it is not so very difficult either. I shall give two examples. If the people in these areas— writers, students, workers, traders, teachers, etc.—decide that they will not allow anyone whose mother tongue is not English to speak in English at any public menting or place, there will be a new climate all over. During the first two or three months let there be intensive propaganda in this regard. Then let notice be given, say, of two or three months, that if a person from the coastal provinces is to speak he should speak in his mother tongue and the organisers of the meeting should arrange to have the speech translated into Hindi. After this, no meeting should be allowed to proceed unless such arrangement is made.

Another suggestion I would make is in regard to official nameplates, be it milestones on the road, or sign-boards at railway stations. Many have gone to jail over this issue. I won't talk of satyagraha any more. Now, wherever you find them and whenever you find them. erase them. If need be, organise bands of young men specifically for this. These are just two examples I have give. There can be many others. A spate of meetings and conferences and study circles of the educated needs to be organised on this subject.

24

RUSSIA'S DEVELOPMENTS

RAMMANOHAR LOHIA

The evaluation of Russia's developments both with a view to discussing their impact on the world as a whole, and to deciding up the Socialist approach to native Communist, has become necessary.

To dismiss the deliberations of the 20th Congress of the Soviet Communist Party as a manoeuvre to delude international opinion would be utterly stupid. Communism may lie and murder like most other doctrines and may even change its opinion from time to time, but whatever opinion it holds for the time being, it must do so with complete sincerity. When these opinions are circulated to thousands of millions of people and they clash with opinions held earlier, and a grim bettle for the ideological loyalty of such vast masses takes place, it cannot be otherwise.

The mass of the Russian people and even their leaders need undoubtedly to be reassured about their own safety and security. Living insecurity and a state of arbitrary arrests and in deaths, wangled justice, absence of law, and general terror deprived large sections of the sense of secured well-being. No people can permanently stay in such conditions, least of all, a people which has been progressing materially. The foreign relations of such a people are also governed by suspicion and lawlessness on its side as well as on that of the others. Such international relationships, poisoned by doubt and lawlessness, become too heavy a burden, like that of a nightmare, for the people most isolated. The Russian people, have, without a doubt, been the most isolated among the world's councils, at least among the white nations. To dispel internal

terror and external isolation has become a primary need of Russian leadership. This cannot be done except by cutting away clean from Stalin and the methods he practised.

The student of history will indeed recognize that it was precisely Stalin who brought Russia and her present leadership to the forefront of world's affairs, in fact, the second weightiest place in respect of industry and armaments. Whether such a fast rise in material power would have been possible in any other way is a matter of speculation. What is incontestable was that Stalin, a great Asian leader whom chance brought at the head of a backward but predominantly European people, and who, while he despised Europeans and loved Asia, wanted to whip and terrorize his backward people into matching and outracing all European advancement, used communism to increase Russia's strength. Communism is perhaps ideally suited as a doctrine to enable backward peoples with a low density of population to run the race of the world, for an otherwise slow development can be compressed into fast strides. What Stalin forgot was that he was practising evil deeds, not in the interest of a new civilization nor even in the enduring interest of his Russian peoples, but in the service of a futile policy of a race with the Europeans, although successful. Stalin was the great Asian in the line of Chengiz Khan, and he brought the pre-dominantly European people of Russia to a level with West Europeans and Americans, and the inevitable tragedy has taken place. The Russian people have no more use for their own maker, for they have become European and civilized. Every Asian people and its leaders must tarry a while and take a leaf out of Stalin's life, that the practice of black deeds for outmatching Europe does not even command enduring recognition and loyalty.

Stalin was among the great criminals of world history, and his crimes are now proved to have been for the very ordinary and pedestrian purpose of enabling a weaker people to eat and kill as well as the stronger peoples of the earth. Now that Russia is as strong as the West-European and American peoples and, also because the internal terror and the external isolation have become insufferable, the return to the European family was necessary, and has taken place. In some ways, it is also a return to the human family. The rules of law will now prevail internally and internationally. The present leaders of Russia have all been accomplices in Stalin's crimes; they are in fact, little jackals to the lion Stalin.

Their denunciation of Stalin when they took part in everyone of his black deeds is patent gibberish. But the world is in too much of a hurry to study details of history, to judge issues on their merits and to appraise individual character minutely. It is only concerned with the present and the future. And the Russian leaders, who command vast power and machines of destruction, are promising it a better present and perhaps a still better future. They are promising it the rule of law. When such a promise comes from the mighty men of the earth, no matter what benditry and crimes they might have practised in the past, the world sits up and listens. The promise sounds true and is true.

Why does the return of Soviet Russia to the European family and in some sense the human family signify ? The answer to this question will depend upon one's assessment of the role of communism as a doctrine. Those who think that communism represents the beginning of a new civilization will continue to expect a revoluti from Russian's re-entry into Europe until a century or a half stable Russian behaviour like that of any other European nation again disillusions them. Russia is now a fit and proper member of the European family. Her institution of nationalized property may yet again cause awkward glances or ugly grimaces among Europeans and Americans, and the possibility of war is not yet eliminated. But the abolition of private property and the institution of social property does not by itself represent a new beginning.

The new beginning shall be made when such forms of property, technology, distribution, and gavernment shall arise as well enable comparatively equal production among all the nations of the world and will incline the individual to a total and all-sided, and not one-sided and maximum expression of his personlity. Communism is not certainly the doctrine of such totality either for the individual or far the various nations of the earth. It is only a variant of the civilization that has enabled European races to hold the earth in their fief and has produced Adam Smith and his successors at one end and Karl Marx and his successors, at the other. As a variant, Russia and communism may yet be able to amend or beautify the European civilization, also to mature its rot and rivalries, and in general take part in the shadow play when the master races of a failing civilization enact its end. Russia and America with one-sixth of the world's population produce two-thirds of its wealth.

The effects of Russian developments must therefore be sought in the narrower sphere of the existing civilization. How will communism jockey for its place in the councils of the world ? How will the Communist peoples under their own governments and the Communist Parties in non-Communist European lands and those in non-Communist coloured lands fare ? Some people imagine that with the entry of Russia into the European and partially the human family, the stage is set for the universal sway of socialism. Those who ascribe it to the greater unscrupulousness of Russia forget that the other European nations are no less unscrupulous, although differently, and also that Russia will now adhere to the rule of law as Europe knows it. The mind of man, however, and its mode of expression seem to indicate that socialism, at least, in speech, will sprawl over the earth.

A careful study of this question would need a proper examination of such concepts and events as, (1) unanimous reconstructions, (2) likely Communist growth, (3) universal hegemony of socialism. The concept of unanimous reconstruction has forcefully emerged out of the Russian Communist Congress. This concept was so long valid only when communism became the government, and through the dictatorship of the proletariat. It has now been extended to cover all such countries whose governments may be non-Communist or non-Socialist but largely pursue a peace policy or a foreign policy sanctified by communism. This is only natural. In order not to weaken peoples and governments whose help is essential to Russia for the purpose of countering, out-matching America, and also to dispel Russia's isolation, international Communists must practice the concept of unanimous reconstructions at least in those areas. Mr. Vinoba Bhave's unanimous Panchayats, Mr. Ashoka Mehta's areas of agreement, Mr. Jayaprakash Narayan's partyless politics, and the earlier Communist concept of dictatorship of the prolateriat and the present concept of unanimous reconstruction are all of one piece. The aims of each of these may naturally differ. That is why their doctrines must inevitably cancel each other at least until one of them usurps the government of the land.

The concept of unanimous reconstruction will now be practised by Communists in India and all similar countries whose governments pursue a passive unattached foreign policy. Communism in these countries will henceforward engage in constitutional debates, perhaps warm and intelligent debates and will expect the

government to enable it to play some part in the nation's economy and administration, and will not force any unconstitutional pressures on it. This will have far-reaching consequences. While the time may yet be distant, perhaps not so very distant, when the spokesmen of communism can be associated with the government or with the several-crore Gandhi Trust, like the spokesmen of Bhoodan and paralysed socialism, Communists will aim at unanimous reconstruction of India and will therefore inevitably desire to be associated with governmental authority and its various expressions. Communist struggles of an unconstitutional character died out in India nearly four years ago except for occasional whimpers which become inevitable. This fact will now be documented and theorized. The documentation and the theory will be built out of the concept of unanimous reconstruction when in opposition is but another name for dictatorship of the proletariat when in government. Until the 20th Congress, Communists liked Nehruism in all the world except in India, and Mr. Nehru liked communism in all the world except in India. After the documentation and theorizing at this particular Congress, communism and Nehruism will like each other in all the world without exception.

The concept of unanimous reconstruction may be somewhat difficult of application in West-European countries. The non-Communist parties of West-Europe and their blocks are finely balanced against each other, and while their quarrels can never be resolved into, unanmity, they are not likely to become so hostile to each other as to use communism as an ally beyond a point. Socialism in France under Guy Mollet illustrates this, Communism likes to keep socialism in power for certain advantagss of foreign policy, for a lossening of the ideological and military West-European front, for such policies as that disarmament may precede European security and German reunification. But it is doubtful whether the point can be stretched very much further. Nevertheless, the re-entry of Russia into the European family will enable her to play some part, however indirect, in the quarrels of such parties as Conservative and Labour in Britain and elsewhere. If Mr. Churchill could somewhat increase his vote by promising to meet Mr. Stalin, even when Russia was not of Europe, why should not Mr. Gaitskell, the Labour leader, now want to make a minor issue of the British government's preparations for the Russian visit ? Exigencies of electioneering in a democracy will give the Russians some freedom

of movement in West Europe, and West-European parties will be prepared to accommodate Russia up to a point for favour shown and benefits received No deciding significance needs to be attached to the development. It is also possible that Communist parties in various lands might want and strive to be absorbed into other parties of their choice, such as Labour of Britain or Congress of India, but whether and when they will meet with success in this regard can be anybody's guess.

The concept of unanimous reconstruction for countries of friendly foreign policy like India and subtler relationships with West Europeans so as to wean them away from tough policies and America, and also with America, so as to wean Americans, preferably under Democratic leadership, away from positions of stength, may at first sight presage added strength to international communism. That will not be so. Communism through peaceful and competitive co-existence will lack the lustre of communism through conflict. No people would ever vote communism to power. They can only suffer it or even welcome it in time of trouble. But communism through competition would ever seek to avoid the trouble that communism through conflict fomented. Without a doubt, the new policies of communism will reduce its following everywhere except in Russia and certain East-European countries. The case of Communist China is somewhat obscure. One does not know to what extent China would need to use terror for the purpose of fast development nor whether the Russian example of rule of law would be somewhat premature for her. Everywhere else, communism would lose its teeth, unless, of course, a warlike situation existed permanently, which would enable it manoeuvre in the sphere of foreign policy. European Russia is the only clear gainer from the new policics of communism. A Nurjehan may elevatingly repent the murder of her former husband in the splendid glory of her new husband's place. What if the repentance took place in a hut or hovel ! Repentance for murder which has brought no gain can never produce moral or saintly sentiments. Most saintliness is the direct outcome of easy conditions of money or power, no matter in how uns.intly a manner acquired. Indian and most other non-Russian communism must repent its black deeds without the splendid halls which Satlin's cruelty built for Russia.

Do recent Communist developments promote the possibility of

universal hegemony of socialism in succeeding decades or centuries ? Very little and only indirectly. To the extent that a Russia of the rule of law builds herself and increases her material power, she will act as a propagandist support to socialism. The point is whether America and similar lands may not continue to outbuild her. Of greatest significance is the fact that Russia would oftener be on the side of the new, the vital and the changing. West Europeans and Americans have too many vested interests in the old order, manufactures rather than machines, machines rather than machine-tools, not to speak of the language or states of imperialism. Because of this national need to associate with the new as the West-Europeans and Americans are associated with the old, Russian action will, in the international sphere, stregthen the new, provided the new is already there on its own.

No evidence has yet been produced to show that Russia or communism will directly advance the universal hegemony or socialism. Russian service to socialism is about as significant as the socialist prattle of Asian government. Even assuming that most or all mankind begins to talk the language of socialism or that certain external forms of existing socialism spread over the earth as capitalism did at one time, such a spread will repeat history. The spread of capitalism revealed its idealism to have been made of clay, for the perfect competition on which it raised its noble edifice just cannot exist on earth. The spread of socialism, that is, its prattle and its external forms, will likewise reveal its idealism to have been made of clay, for productive equality among nations and the full individual can never be the indirect outcome of a creed and must be sought for directly. Rich Australia with three persons to the square mile, Russia with 20, and America with 50 are pitted against poor India with 300, and similar other lands. This is only one roadblock; the other is that of the maximum development of the individual in any one direction and not his total development.

Only then will socialism command the loyality of mankind when its doctrine is able to answer these great facts of mankind. Russia and communism can do nothing to create such a doctrine, the same as the present ruling classes of Asia cannot. They can, at best and in certain situations, assist in the growth of such a doctrine. There is reason to believe that such a doctrine is being gradually fashioned through thought and deed by forces all over

the world such as the Socialist Party in India. The total lack of dissent in the Communist world against the attack on Stalin proves either the masterful hold of the creed or the complete pettiness of the mind in certain conditions. The miraculous creed and the petty mind seem to be two sides of the same coin.

Indian Communists were robbed of all self-respect and that minimum of pride which holds the personality together in the moment that Stalin was pulled down for them, it was not just a confession of error, after having built up the country's economy, as it was with the Russians had sinned with profit. Indian Communist had sinned without a gain. They had during the open rebellion of 1942 associated with foreign rule in treacheroues suppression of their ownpe ople, they had to abuse Mahatma Gandhi. When they did this, they were sustained by the martyr's faith in the world revolution and its leader Stalin.

The faith and its leader are now dashed to bits, and the books of their world revolution are glorifying Mahatma Gandhi as a people's leader like Lenin. One would have thought that Indian Communist would need all the sympathy of their countrymen to restore their self-respect and broken personality. But nothing of the kind seems needed, for they have so remarkably erased from their memory those black deeds of what must now according to their own standards appear treason to them. At least their leadership has. Perhaps, among the mass of Communist membership, there are large numbers who are still feeling an overwhelming sense of physical dirt, of having just been immersed from head to foot into a pool of blood and excrescence. To these, our affectionate care and words of heart felt sympathy must go. We must assist to cleanse them. They had indeed done great wrongs, but they did so in service of a dark faith and not for personal gain, and they can alone any cleansing themselves of that creed of slimy mind bewitched deeds. Of these bewitched deeds there is no doubt, for who does not know of Stalin and communism persuading groups of South American workmen to dynamite themselves so as to disable their copper mines from supplying strategic copper to the US ? Such deeds have occured in varving degrees all over the world.

The concept of unanimous reconstruction and subtler relationships will end this witchery in several lands, particularly like India. Now is the time for a party of socialism, as democratic and

peaceful as it is revolutionary, to make a powerful appeal to the Communist rankers through deed as well as word. The effort to enlighten them through thought and speech unsustained by action will not tempt them; also, action unsupported by thought may scare them away as repetition of an earlier adventure. Great caution must be maintained in respect of the mode of action, for the socialism of India is not yet mature in the sphere of non-violence and civil disobedience, and it may be foolishly tempted to brag or double-talk with a view to attract the Communist rankers,

Let not socialism ever again make the mistake of trying to attract others by appeasing them of forsaking its own principles. In any case, Communist rankers must have had too much of violence and concealment, and would be receptive to any philosophy that makes them see its futility through action as well as the intelligent word. Furthermore, the rational word, however deceptive, has been the mark of communism, as comparatively sound instincts have characterized socialism in India. The Socialist rankers must lose no time in supporting their sound instincts with the intelligent word. This they can best achieve through regular participation in thought sessions and study of books and periodicals whenever possible. Action, however peaceful, unsupported by thought and organisation, has hitherto been a malady of Indian socialism. This malady must be overcome if the Socialist Party is to progress, and in the process, attract basically brave and honest men, whom other parties once grievously misled. Above all, nothing of what has been said should act as a cover for avoidance of action.

25

PRESIDENTIAL ELECTION

RAMMANOHAR LOHIA

Deep rifts cannot be covered long with paper, although the Congress party has for the time being done so seemingly well with its cleavage. Their presidential nominee got 447 Parliament votes. This was only two more than the number of Congress MPs who were known to have cast their votes. The Congress vote should have been 20 to 25 votes larger. From among the opposition, the Muslim League and several Independent progressives had openly declared their resolve to support the Congress nominee. One may also safely surmise that, in view of very little attempt having been made to explain the issues involved, most muslims belonging to no matter which party voted for the Congress candidate. Other minority M.Ps, particularly those unattached to and political party in all probability voted for the Congress. What happened to these 20 to 25 votes that the Congress declaredly and openly got from the opposition. Obviously, an equal number of Congress men voted for the opposition candidate but the story does not stop there. One Congress member of Parliament is prepared to give a list of around 75 names from among Congress parliamentarians, who voted for the opposition candiate. This may well have been a promise that was made to him and others. Those who make the promise assert that they fulfilled it. Even assuming a certain discount, it is highly probable that a number larger than 50 from among the Congress parliamentarians voted for the opposition candidate. What happened to these 50 or 75 votes ?

If 50 Congress M.Ps. voted for Subba Rao, the Opposition candidate, we have to account for another 25 to 30 opposition M.Ps. in addition to those who had openly supported Dr. Zakir Hussain, the Congress candidate; if 75, the accounting will have to be done for 70 or 75 M.Ps. Both Congress and Opposition parties are trying to cover up their deep rifts with paper. The bursting when it comes may result in an explosion.

We can only guess who these Opposition M.Ps were ? In one or two cases of political parties, the case may be more or less a certainty. The rift was probably spread over all the parties. We have been told of an Opposition M.P. from Rajasthan who hugged the Prime Minister's letter to his heart and declared how he could vote otherwise after he had received that letter. We do not know what the result was after friends from his own and other parties had explained the situation to him that this was a cyclostyled letter sent to all members of parliament and not especially to him. This particular member belongs to a party which might otherwise be regarded as a rabid opponent of the Congress candidate. We do not know how many such innocents were abroad. Considering the level of political understanding of the people and their representatives, 10 to 20 such innocents would be a very small number but would make a big difference to the tally of the presidential vote.

Let us never forget that America, Russia, Britain, China and France have their finger in every pie, i.e., cooking in every backward country. They have their lobbies. Some of them even have their political parties. Some have influential individuals to work their will out, or those cunning. We do not know if France has any significant backing in this country; if so, France is indeed the cleverest of them all and is the perfect criminal who leaves no trace of its crime. Britain is near perfect. She operates largely through the top bureaucrat and perhaps also the top minister and with subtlety and charm. She might also be influencing the judgement of a leading politicians or two with equal subtlety and charm. If Britain took a hand, it must have been in favour of stability, i.e., the Congress nominee, but we just do not know through whom and how many were influenced. China can for the time being be easily put out of the way. Her will is to be surmised. It does not operate towards stability in its own country, so why should it in India. One should not never the less make categorical statements about national wills operating on foreign soil, but one may hold it to be

highly improbale that China-oriented parties and individuals should have voted for the Congress nominee.

That leaves us Russia and America and the entire gamut of political parties in the country, Government or Opposition. There is not the slightest doubt that Russia and America are neuralgic about any instability anywhere in the world, so long as it is not of their own making. The victory of the opposition candidate would have upset all or most existing arrangements. Russians and Americans are so powerful that they take a little time to gather information and to think. They may not have been aware of what an upset Congress defeat would cause, but they began becoming aware of it when they had enough time to be informed and to think. They certainly took a hand in the later stages of the Presidential campaign. They persuaded their parties and persons to go slow. Gossip is current that Russia-oriented individuals and parties were split half and half, half for the Congress nominee and half for the Opposition nominee. Many years must elapse before the truth will be out, if ever. It is was a half-half split, around 15 MPs are counted for; if it was a wholesale walk over to the Congress candidate, around 30.

There is yet another party which may have decided to split half-half, or else given some of its America or West Europe oriented members freedom to vote as they liked, not that they were particularly waiting for this freedom. While America's policy framers are slow, painstaking, comprehensive but lacking in broad visions, America's policy executors in the newly independent countries are, we surmise, hustling over bearing, aggressive and domineering towards those whom they keep in clover. What they did is very difficult to surmise. They may have originally wanted just a token contest. When it threatened to be something more than that, they advised their constituents to go slow. Or they might have advised their closer associates even to support the Congress candiate. We would not be surprised if the Birla-Tata-MPs who belong largely to the Congress, Swatantra and Jan Sangh parties all voted for the Congress candidate. We must however state our doubts in this connection, for some Birla MPs were loudly professing to have voted for the Opposition candidate in the Central Hall of Parliament. Play acting is however not a new thing in speculation or politics, so both of which these gentlemen have been used all their lives, and some of them also probably to a poker face.

The ugly foreigner is here with all his might and unwisdom. One heard of the ugly American. To that, the answer of the ugly Russian was also composed. It is neither the ugly American nor the ugly Russian; it is just the ugly foreigner. Invested with the might of money and weapons, the ugly foreigner is abroad. To his armoury which is in itself very effective, he has added charms and mantras. what used to be religion in ancient times and is today ideology, the ideology of the free world of the Americans and the ideology of the equal world of the Russians or the Chinese. Not unless the young men and women of this country learn to discern the hand of the ugly foreigner in our country's politics and decide to throw him out with all their strength, can our politics become adult. We repeat that we have talked of the ugly foreigner. The sympathetic foreigner, among whom have also been Indians and still are, should be welcome every where, for his political activity is spontaneous. But that kind of foreigner of spontaneous sympathy has died out of we should prefer to think is dying out. There is time yet to save the race.

Me can understand the neuralgic desire of the US and the USSR for stability; they have a lot to lose. But when the same anxiety is shared by the leadership of our political parties and to some extent also our people, we are unable to find a rational explanation for it. Do they have in mind some racial memories of maidens being lifted off roads ? We can assure them that precisely those factors which are working for instability and change will make any such happenings on a large scale impossible and in fact, might even reduce numbers of those already taking place. Do they have in mind killings and assault as the order of the day ? We can once again assure them that forces driving for instablity and change are hostile to such physical assaults. Our position can best be understood if we state what words we like and what we dislike. We dont't mind the words instability, change, anarchy, lawlessness, disorder. and the acts that they convey. We dislike the words assault, killing, injury, violence, and the acts these convey.

What may happen is another variety of acts. Large spaces of land inside a city reserved for use of race or golf, or pleasurable grounds of the rich may become the target of people's action. The kind of relationship that now exists between the bureaucracy and the police on one hand and the people on the other may also become another such target. We hope that such incidents would

not be too protracted or many before a solution is reached. The people are obviously yearning for new types of relationships among themselves. This yearning must soon be satisfied. That is why the sooner instability and change take place, the better. Those who are irrationally afraid of instability and change are only protracting the agony of a half-dead people in a state of constant simmering without any effective action. In fact this creates as atmosphere of take instability, which stimulates without consumating, which creates fears without achieving any solutions.

Communist China has enlivened its people. There 600 million or 700 million people are awake, at least tolerably awake. The awakening has taken evil direction. There is therefore a fear that a similar awakening in India might take similarly evil directions, might augment the forces of physical assault or war in the world. This fear is prevalent among the ruling classes of India, but more so, among the US and the USSR. An Indian who becomes victim of such fears is not worth his salt. We must enliven our people. Our 500 million must become awake. We should in fact want all our 600 million people to become awake. So long as existing relationships are not disturbed and made unstable, how on earth can the 400 or 450 million people who live in a state of permanent stupor be enlivened. If anybody says that it is food which will enliven them, we say, true enough, but they must produce more food in order to eat more of it, and they must also share it somewhat better than they do at present. Greater production and comparative equalising of scarcity can be accomplished only through disarranging the present structure of the mind and putting ideas of change and hope into it, not alone the mind of the few million at the top but the mind of all the 500 million.

Opposition elements which had sponsored the candidature of Mr. Subba Rao were probably not aware of what they were doing. They were more or less like the Congressmen who supported Mr. Subhash Chandra Bose in his contest with Mr. Pattabhi, without knowing or caring to know that it was a contest with Mahatma Gandhi. They may also have been indulging in some fun or frolic and their foreign advisers may not have been very alert at the start. They are now trying to throw the blame for their incompetence and failure on (a) the religion-oriented propaganda of the Jan Sangh, (b) the somewhat aggressive

campaigning by some SSP elements.

We do not wish to say much about the Jan Sangh propaganda. Some of it was unwholesome. But to say that it scared away any votes would be arrant nonsense. In fact the story is current that four to five Jan Sangh adherents actually voted for Dr. Zakir Hussain. Their propaganda did not have much meaning except to create a certain atmosphere, some of which we must say must be taken note of in achieving a really secular society. Dr. Zakir Hussain is on record that he did not dissuade the Hindu wanting to marry his grand-daughter from change of faith. The Jan Sangh and the President of the Re-public are the two sides of the same coin; one wishes for conversion to Hinduism and the other to Islam. It may however be noted in passing that the Jan Sangh talk of a national faith is moonshine. Their desire for a uniform civil code as also similar other national uniformities is just a talking point. They make use of the Muslim socialists, who had defected to their ranks to denounce the Socialist Party and its candidates for wanting to change Muslim personal law, that is the Quranic law, and in that wise to destroy Islam. In any event the President of the Republic must now strive to build Muslim opinion in favour of the uniform civil code, a promise which he made several years ago and which he must now begin to fulfill in the interest of truth and secularism. He must begin doing so in right earnest. Also because the prime minister of India only a few months ago was guilty of violating her oath of loyalty to the constitution, was guilty of double-talk, and while swearing for a uniform civil code, promised Muslims not to change their personal law.

Those who are accusing the socialist elements of having queered the pitch for Mr. Subba Rao, have some guilt to conceal. Their conscience is perhaps pricking them. They are in need of a scape goat. Let us try to recall the facts. The DMK, Swatantra and Communists had eagerly sponsored Mr. Subba Rao, and Socialists had also fallen in. Then they just sat quiet. They issued statements from day to day, more particularly through bar councils, as if these would have any effect on the 4000 and odd legislators who are entitled to vote. As against this over 200 emissaries of the prime minister were around in all the country contacting every body promising, threatening, cajoling, tempting and heaven knows what else. Every

opposition legislator was personally contacted by a Congress campaigner, preferably a legislator. The Congress was also day by day succeeding in loosening the opposition and tearing away bits of it. One day the Muslim League declared its support to the Congress. Another day the Independent Progressive Group declared their support to it. A third day the DMK declared their irresolution. Rajas in whatever party, in particular the party which goes by the fantastic name of the People's Revolution Party were back sliding.

After all these events had already happened, some socialists stepped in with their clarificatory propaganda, with their statements and speeches on what was at stake, also with what little personal canvassing that was possible during the short time left. Which votes did this propaganda scare ? The lie is being spread that the Congress party was solidified by this propaganda If anything the opposite is true. Some at least of the 50 to 75 Congress votes that were cast for Mr. Subba Rao, were influenced by the socialist clarification. If their case is that opposition elements were scared away, they must tell which. Some opposition elements were in fact scared away. But the reason lay not in the socialist propaganda, but in themselves. They have not yet understood the mechanics of change in this country. They are scared at the next event forgetting that the one after that will bring hope and change. They are afraid of each other in the opposition and therefore afraid of themselves. It is also possible that their foreign advisers are mighty afraid of taking any risks. But then, they should not be tardy with their advice. They should not let a process start and then scotch it.

A possibility exists that this interlude of the presidential election may have proved a blessing in disguise A very curious situation has come to exist. In an open voting the Congress is at a disadvantage. In a secret voting the oppostion is at a disadvantage. This is a totally new situation. It did not ever exist in the past twenty years. The feeling of the people against the Congress party is today running so high that anyone elected in opposition to it will have to think twice or thrice before coming out openly in support of it. On the other hand, the temptations and blandishments in the power of the Congress party are still so large that a considerable number of oppositionists veer to it in a secret voting. We may, therefore, assume that

such opposition betrayal as took place in the presidential election, would not be possible in an open vote. Such an assumption however cannot be made for the Congress side. Congress defectors were obviously motivated by some principle. They too are tired of the stagnation and rot in the country, perhaps as much as the oppositionists. When a fine opportunity offers, they may not be found wanting.

A major achievement during the Presidential compaigning, history shall never forget, but contemporaries may also strike to remember. The Home Minister and the Minister for Parliamentary Affairs, both declared publicly that the defeat of their Presidential nominee would not entail the defeat of their government. Such a gross and vulgar statement, so unprincipled and meanly selfish, would be difficult to parallel in the history of parliamentary democracy. The purpose of this statement was clear. It was meant to deter defectors, to tell them that no matter which way they voted, they could not change the government. One main motivation of Congress defectors must surely have been the desire to change the government of stagnation and famine. If there were any feeble hearted ones among Congress defectors, which is hardly likely, they must have been reassured by these statements that no matter which way they voted, their government would continue.

A question is often asked, how can that motley opposition ever govern the country. The answer is, how could this motley Congress, with Mr. Krishna Menon at one end to Mr. S.K. Patil at the other govern the country. But talking points and arguments apart, the time has come for young men in all parties and without any party, it think and strive for change, if possible through the parliament, when necessary outside it, and more probably through a mixture of both. Let us tell ourselves that we have become an indolent people, indolent in all overwork, indolent in the producing of wealth and indolent in the making of revolutions. Neither change nor food will drop from the heavens or through the exploits and manouvers of a few brave leaders. They will come alone through hard work.

26

ANECDOTES ABOUT MAHATMA GANDHI

RAMMANOHAR LOHIA

This is a day of story telling. Whether there would be point or none at all in some of my stories will be entirely secondary, but all these stories except one will be of direct first hand experience. Not one would be related on somebody else's authority and in some cases I might offer some comments which one might accept or reject according to one's choice.

This story, which I relate, the only one second hand, refer to the period when Mahatma Gandhi made his first appearance on the Indian political scene. He had been asked by Mr. Gokhale not to make any political pronouncements for at least one year during which he was to have studied the Indian scene. When he did make his first political speech it turned out to be, well, what is generally called a bombshell, a speech in the Banaras University about princes, kings and British Rule which so infuriated a part of the audience that there was some kind of walk-out. Some of you might not be similar with walk-outs, that used to take place even during Mahatma Gandhi's speech, but this one was some time in 1916 or thereabouts. Versions of that speech are available but I am told that none of them is authentic at least with regard to one remark which Gandhiji made. Talking about the extent of mental degradation to which a subject nation descended he said that he would prefer a Viceroy to be killed by an assassin rather than let his nation succumb meekly and in a cowardly fashion to martial law. I have not seen it in any of the versions which are available

to us. It appears that there has been some later editing of that speech and those who are still alive and listened to that speech will do a service if they substantiate what I have just said, because their all it does not really mater very much whether Gandhiji did make that remark because it would not in any way detract from his creed of non-violence. The mere recording of the fact that in order to drive a point home he would prefer the killing a Viceroy to the entire humiliation and sub-section of a whole nation to martial law, a subjection amounting to this that the people did not stir at all, would be a duty to history. It would not in my way take away from the basic proposition he outlined in that speech that to would prefer a state of peaceful revolt to the killing of viceroys and the like. That point he made at very great length, bur in order to show that cowardliness, weakness, submission to tyranny were not a part of his scheme of peaceful resistance he used this rather colourful and powerful expression. In connexion with the enormous amounts spent on the Viceroy's security, Mahatma Gandhi is on record that the Viceroy should prefer to have his life ended rather than preserved in such secretive manner and at such great cost. But that is quite another matter. I, like countless others of my generation, had the opportunity to meet Gandhiji at a fairly early age, when we were at school. Students of my age at 9 or 10 or around left school at the first call of non-co-operation that Gandhiji gave in 1919 or 1920. My father took me to Gandhiji and all that I remember of that incident is that I touched his feet and he touched my back. I am proud of that and on one occasion when Gandhiji asked me. when I had first seen him, I related that incident, he said, yes, of course, you would remember but I don't remember it Countless persons of my generation have I believe gone through similar experience and have been powerfully influenced by the touch of that benign and powerful hand and then in later years some of us have been fortunate enough to see or feel that touch at greater detail. I may here did that I never touched anybody else's feet outside of the family and that too when very young.

Once I missed it when I was a student in Europe and was taking any holiday in Paris. I learnt that Mahatma Gandhi was arriving in Paris at 5.30 in the morning at a station Gare du nord or Gare du Lyons, which one I do not remember. Five-thirty in the morning was a rather awkward hour even in India, not to talk

of Europe, and especially for me at that age.

I decided that I would go to the station. I did get up at the right time but it was exactly five-thirty when I looked at my watch so that while I should have been at railway station I was in my hotel getting up at exactly that time.

Of those incidents that took place during the Second Round Table Conference of England, I would like to draw attention to one which perhaps is not so well known. That was when Charlie Chaplin met Mahatma Gandhi. The French newspapers brought out a paragraph of these two men, one great for centuries and the other at least for our own century and touched up the two photographs so that one looked like the other, a close resemblance. I imagine the photographer had put on a few tufts of hair on Gandhiji's head and taken away a few from Charlie Chaplin's head. And, underneath, the caption said, the tragic comedian and the comic tragedian meet. It was a great compliment. The comic tragedian coming from a Frenchman who deals in banter is a pretty accurate description of at least one aspect of Gandhiji's personality. But then one has doubts on who was the Comic Tragedian and who the Tragic Comedian. That was left to the reader.

The first live contact I had with him was when I returned from my studies in Europe and had the occasion to listen to a conversation between Gandhiji and Malaviyaji. I smuggled myself in through the courtesy of Prabhavati Devi, whom I came to know earlier than her husband. I said, now, I go behind you, you are to act as my shield.

You sit in front and I behind and then we listen to what goes on between these two persons. She said, why don't you uncover yourself ! I said no at least not today. I listened to that conversation. The Congress was down and out. Most persons thought the British were on top and in such stages of national depression all kinds of ideas are afloat. Ideas mainly of compromise, and Malaviyaji after a great deal of prefacing suggested that a deputation on behalf of the Congress party should go out to England to plead the cause of India. Gandhiji of course gave a vary patient hearing. He would have done so in anybody's case but then it was Pandit Madan Mohan Malaviya. But, after having listened to him right up to the end, all that Gandhiji did was to say in a very calm persuasive and yet firm tone. What are you talking about ? Have we not come to that stage when it is no longer possible to think in

terms of a deputation of the Congress Party going over to England to plead India's cause and that was an end of the matter. That stage had indeed passed, though some persons were not aware of it.

A few days later, I was asleep in the room next to Gandhiji's and I used then to rise late, but because of the kind but not so considerate internation of a common friend Mr. Jamnalal Bajaj, who dragged me out of my bed, because that was the only time that Gandhiji had and I was to take a train to Calcutta an hour later. I was led to his presence in a very dishevelled condition. The first rather the second question he asked me was 'are you well off ?' If anybody else had asked me that or anyone were asked feat at the very first meeting and that too the second question "are you well did ?" how horrid I or he might have felt about it. Look at this man asking him very rude question at the very first time that one talks to him but, as it same from Gandhiji, I recollect that I had not the slightest awareness of anything wrong in it, absolutely none whatever. Jamnalalji assured him that he need not worry on that topic. It appeared as if a whole load was off a mind. Then it is alright, we shall meet again he said, and the whole thing was dismissed, because, obviously, a man of that kind goes into the details of every question that he takes up. And having probably been told earlier that I intended to do politics and, in fact, I had already taken part in an illegal activity, a big detail was that I should be well off or had to be taken care of and as soon as he was told that there was no need for him to worry, then a load was off his mind. That is not to say that we have all imbibed that care for details. In fact I am, or perhaps was, particularly guilty in that matter, and lack of resources and a different epoch may also have something to do with it. But then I am merely relating stories.

Later, I had occasion to edit a weekly on behalf of my party it was then called the Congress Socialist Party, and I had taken an assurance from Gandhiji that he would write an article for us. He was very kind in such matters. I suppose that my youth and all that may have influenced him.

All great men are particularly fond of young persons. Even when some great men gives you a kind of rough dressing down or very harsh talking to, take it from me that he is fond of you. But then young men upto the age of twenty-five, and beyond that if they show arrogance or non-chalance, I suppose people don't like it.

I wrote an article on the All India Village Industries Association which was Gandhiji's effort to tide over the depression that had come upon the failure of the 1932-33 Movement. I wonder whether such movements can be described as failures but it was at any rate a temporary failure. During such periods, Gandhiji always talked in terms of some constructive action towards which he could direct the attention of the people because no person or party can live permanently on a diet of struggle. One cannot make a whole people go through a phase of struggling eternally. There has got to be an interregnum. All other political creeds and philosophies that I have known of have no solution for such periods of interregnum except some kind of subdued agitation but Gandhiji's solution used to be constructive activity.

In an earlier period there was the All-India Charkha Association. In 1934-35. it was the All India Village Industries Association and later it was the Talimi Sangh, the Educational Association. There is a whole pattern of constructive activities but then at that time I like many others thought that it was old dame's activity. I do not think I was so stupid as to quite use that phrase because I believe that women and men are equally important with regard to all spheres of activity and so if I did use an uncouth phrase it was probably old men and women's work. In any case, the essential idea of my article was that the freedom of India could not be won by such piecemeal, minor activities of the Village Industries Association, which might at the most favourable reckoning be able to give some more vitamins to the people but would never be able to set them upon their feet in order to combat the British Empire. I pointed out that the task of ending foreign rule in India was so colossal that activities like husking of rice and hand pounding of rice were not commensurate to that end and perhaps I used very harsh phrases. I sent a copy of the journal to Gandhiji with a request that he might express his ideas on that subject. I suppose that was the only occasion when he was really angry with me because a post card I got from him in reply said, you must never expect me to write because I find that you have not the slightest patience with your opponent's viewpoint. That did irritate me considerably. I will not say I was angry. I wrote back a reply saying that probably I was a little careless in the use of my phrases but then he should have tried to get at my meaning and he could very well have written a reply to that meaning and swift came back

an answer which was as sweet as the earlier letter was angry.

I am a nomad and I do not preserve letters but the one letter I should have liked to preserve all my life was that you have not the slightest patience with your opponent's viewpoint. It is really a grave disease, not to listen to the opponent. Not that I would ever fancy myself in a position of opposition to Mahatma Gandhi. If one may not find it easy to accept the viewpoint of an opponent, one should at least listen to it carefully and understand what lie has to say and that is a faculty which we are singularly losing in the modern world. We get so obsessed with our own ideas that, when the other fellow talks to us and tries to point out the draw-backs and loopholes in our reasoning, we do not listen to him. We seem to be listening to ourselves and often I get the impression talking to persons as to whether I have been really talking to them because they go on in their train of thought irrespective of what I might have said. To understand the opponent's viewpoint is very different from accepting it and at this moment I wonder whether I would fundamentally revise my opinion on the All-India Village Industries Association. I suppose I would in one sense, but not so in another, because I have perceived this that in a great movement there has got to be constructive union, whether that constructive action is on the individual plane or on the mass plane, on the plane of the few selected workers or on the plane of the mass of the people. I perhaps will not accept even today Gandhiji's dictum that the Spinning wheel is the sun around which the entire system of constructive actions revolves. I would rather have the spade as the sun around which the system of constructive action revolves, the spade to be used by millions and tens of millions of persons for the purposes of digging irrigation ditches, tanks, ponds, roads, minor canals and so forth. Tens of millions of persons can be diverted to this kind of endeavour. But of course it ties up with several other questions such as the redistribution of land. Pardon me for the comment I made on the story. When I had occasion later to go to Gandhiji with regard to a campaign against some of the repressive laws that the Britishers had enacted and whether it was Gandhiji or somebody else who drew attention to this little incident, I asked with a laugh if he would now consider the question of writing an article for my paper to which he said, look, I have already reproduced an article from your paper in mine, namely, the Harijan. It was an article on the agricultural problem

of India and then with that hilarious laugh which he alone could command, he said, one has to learn even from Ravan. Of course he was Ram and I was Ravan. I did not despair and even Ravan was a very learned person.

I would pass over other occasions of an intimate character for a session of the All India Congress Committee was held a little before the last world war broke out, when the question of Passive Resistance and Civil Disobedience by Indians in South Africa came up. Indian in South Africa had been frequently resisting unjust laws in that territory. Gandhiji had himself drafted the Resolution which came up before the A.I.C.C. I had already done my bit on that day with regard to world peace and so forth. I thought that the president of the Congress party had committed a grievous error in sending out a telegram to a certain world peace congress in Paris committing India to a rather non-neutral view of things. I compelled the president through a question, which was preceded by a letter, to make a clarification which somewhat countered the telegram. Apart from that, when this Resolution came up, I found that it referred to Indians in South Africa as British Indians in South Africa and also that it called upon the Indian community in South Africa to carry out civil disobedience against both of which I moved amendments, one, that Indians had better be called Indians, whether they lived in South Africa or India, and not British Indians, and, two that the effort at civil disobedience in South Africa had better be a kind of united front among all the oppressed communities, Indians, Negroes, Arabs and all the rest of them, even poor whites. Luckily a great leader of the Congress Party happened to see my point and supported the amendments and they passed. It was a good thing and a great thing. And, as I had done my day's work, I wandered about, you must remember that I was very young then, this was in 1939, and I talked to people and did things here and there until their was some kind of hurried searching after me and I found that Mr. Mahadeva Desai had came with a message from Gandhiji. Flutter and flurry and a great deal of excitement, the members of the Working Committee were seated on the dais. On that occassion I found that every one was trying to call me to himself but I settled down with the persons who had supported my amendments and whom at that time I liked very much.

The story came out that Gandhiji was very angry with the

amendments and that he would have the A.I.C.C. pass his Resolution or none at all. And then this great leader of the Congress party tried to persuade me to take another view of things and agree to the reasoning that they put forward, to which I said, it is only four hours between now and when we paseed that resolution. We were perfectly familiar with all the arguments even then and I tried to explain that this civil disobedience movement of all the communities may become somewhat risky and yet I did not see any force in the reasoning that sought to back Gandiji. I said that it was only a matter of four hours between the point at which we passed the resolution and when Mahatma Gandhi sent his ultimatum.

Congress leaders felt that I was being adamant but then I looked at Mahadevbhai and said, your reasoning does not convince me but the fact remains that neither the A.I.C.C. nor any numbers of person like me are in a position to conduct a civil disobedience in South Africa. That movement has to be conducted by Gandhiji, and therefore if he is unable to accept our viewpoint, naturally, I have to choose between a civil disobedience that takes place although it is of an inferior variety and none at all. So thut is the choice before me, to which Mahadevbhai said, yes, that is the case, that is the correct standpoint. I said that on that basis I naturally have no other course but to consent to the withdrawal of the amendment. The withdrawal was placed before the A.I.C.C. The A.I.C C was almost breaking up and it passed the withdrawal, so that the resolution was passed in its original form except that nobody tried to suggest that Indians should be called British Indians. At least, that much was accepted without any debate. When a person gets set in certain habits and Mahatma Gandhi had got into the habit of referring to Indians as British Indians, because of those days in South-Africa, when he carried out the civil disobedience campaign, there is often nothing more to it except an unconscious routine that is rejected when attention is drawn to it. There is a little post-script to this. As I was going out of the A.I.C.C. meeting, Shri Subhas Chandra Bose came along and asked me if I had realised who the power was, Mahatma Gandhi or the Congress party. I said that I had been realising it all the time and acting accordingly but that there were some who had the realisation but did not act in accordance with it. Gandhiji's strength could indeed be more powerful than that of

the Congress party. A resolution passed by the party was vetoed by him and the veto was later accepted by the party. There was another sequel to this. Sometime later he wrote an article, an affectionate criticism, something about my inexperience but my humanitarianism and so forth. I called on him and tried to put before him this other viewpoint that all the oppressed and exploited races of the world, no matter where they lived, must some day find a way of agreeing among themselves and acting so as to end the established order of things. I implored Gandhiji that he should give effect to this idea. He said that, in principle, he did not object, but asked me to work it out and directed me to the Working Committee, which I realised was a thoroughly useless affair. He asked me to write out a resolution and send it to the Working Committee and get it passed there. I told him outright that these were much bigger things than could be handled by the Congress Working Committee. If he took it up, this idea of welding together all the oppressed peoples of the earth in order to direct a powerful blow at tyranny then something might come out of it. Gandhiji did not do it directly, but I am happy to say that something of that kind is happening in our era. The South African civil disobedience campaign has already resulted in over 1000 prisoners, Indians, Negroes, Arabs and perhaps even the poor whites against unjust and repressive laws of the South African Government. Whether this period of 13 years, exactly the time between 1939 and 1952, could have been more gainfully employed in order designedly to assist such movements as the one taking place in South Africa now is a matter for enquiry and thought.

I believe that we have made errors, many errors and one of these errors was that we did not designedly assist such policies and movements. It is perfectly true India under British Rule was not the same as free India today and any combined effort of the Indians and Negroes in South Africa would have brought upon both of them far more malicious counter attacks by the beast, shall we call him a beast, that Malan. No such person should be called a beast. Beasts are good. Although Free India has not been able to exercise authority in any international sphere, one may assume that the position might have been worse, And yet if, in thought and in some kind of propagandist agitation, a deliberate approach had been made in earlier times to bring Negroes and Indians together in a common struggle against imperialism and

other tyrannies the situation today would have been somewhat better. The present is still pregnant with that kind of choice. Probably tomorrow and the day after, you have a Tunisian freedom fighter coming to your city and you will have occassion to extend your support to another nation struggling for its freedom in Africa. The whole of Africa is already afire and in a year or two or may be three years, you will find Africa emerging as a free territory and I hope after some time, not a very remote time, also some kind of a United Africa.

When the world war broke out, some months after, Mahatma Gandhi made a statement immediately after meeting the British Viceroy which was broadcast by the All India Radio. There was an expression of grief over the contemplated destruction of the Westminster Abbey, the Abbey being one of the most remarkable monuments of British history and British architecture. At the prospect of such destruction and what the war might bring to the British people, Gandhiji broke down in tears. And there were further such observations. The A.I.R. edited that statement and did not give it out in full. Such parts were given out as made men like me thoroughly angry and was one of those rare occasions when I was really angry with Gandhiji. Of course, I had known him too well to imagine that he had consented to assist the British war, but then I thought that, out of humanitarianism, not a real humanitarianism but samething wishy-washy and tearful, he had gone too far in committing himself to the British Viceroy. Some kind of a sentimental concern over the British people and their fate resulted in Gandhiji breaking down in tears on the contemplated destruction of the Westminster Abbey. When I read this statement in full in the newspapers of the next day, my anger subsided somewhat. The effect of it was not so bad. Nevertheless the fact remained that Gandhiji had expressed certain sentiments which seemed to convey a preferential attitude towards England in the war that had broken out. And I wrote a letter to him saying that, although I was angry at the A.I.R. broadcast, the statement in full left no doubt in my own mind. I did not for a moment think that Gandhiji had agreed to compromise with the British on the issue of Indian freedom, but any such statement coming from him did detract from his role as a world leader, because he had shown preference for one people over another. The Philosopher, Nietzsche, has indeed said that even while one wants to embrace

the whole world and one can only embrace one person as its representative. Some of us might, white embracing a person be lucky to think that we are embracing a representative of the whole human fact. That is a great idea. So I wrote to Gandhiji saying that it was perfectly clear to me that, when he talked about the destruction of Westminster Abbey, he was trying to embrace the whole of mankind and all its architectural achievements and historical glories and, because he could not do so concretely, be elected the Westminster Abbey as a representative of all that existed all over the World. I took it that he would break down in tears in quite the same seasion if, say the Museum of Munschen were destroyed. I am glad to say that Gandhiji immediately wrote out another statement for the Harijan saying it was so and whether the Westminster Abbey or the Munschen museum or, now I would make another addition to it, the Kremlin in Russia, or a corresponding historical monument in the U.S.A. for example, the Jefferson Memorial, whichever it is, its destruction would cause him agony. It was good, because we were fighting not only for our own freedom, but we were also fighting for certain foundations on which the new world had to be built. When I later met Gandhiji, he told me to write him at once whenever I felt he had misstated any national or world issues in relation to the war, which gave me a perfect freedom to tell him whatever I felt like on whatever occasion. When after a long spell in jail, I got out a few weeks before the great Open Rebellion of 1942, I felt that other leaders of the Congress were going very far in committing the country to the British viewpoint. They had started talking in terms of raising guerilla forces to assist British against the Japanese and others. Sir Stafford Cripps had come to India with a cabinet mission at that time. I thought when my father gave me the idea, that we could persuade Gandhiji to make an approach to the British Government for having Indian cities declared open. In a war, it is open for any country to demand that a certain city or group of cities be recognised as open even by the enemy. When a city is declared open, the country will not be able to garrison that city or use it as a theatre for production of weapons. And the consequence on the other side is that the enemy will not destroy that city or bomb it. I went to Gandhiji with the suggestion that he might ask the British Government to declare all cities of India as open. I recall we had a three-day debate about

it. I tried all the resources of history, politics and geography and all the rest that I could command. I even brought in Ashwathama and Krukshetra and whatever else. I said that even in ancient times warring armies used to leave out big cities with their conglomeration of humanity and did no war there and so there is some kind of an evidential record even in far off days.

Gandhiji finally said : There seems to be a kink in your argument. I was not aware of the kink except for my desire that India should have a full and final combat with the British Empire. That was the idea at the back of my mind. In fact, this whole idea of having cities declared open was but a partial manifestation of that desire that we must go in for a full struggle against British. Then Gandhiji spoke : I can see what you are driving at. You want to fight with the British, don't you ? I said that is what I want, and then he said : Why don't you say so ? That is what you want, alright let us go ahead with it but then we can't just have a fight by asking for it. Let us see what things happen. To which I said no matter whether he accepted this idea of open cities or not I took it that from then on from week to week the Harijan will carry at least one article from him declaring definitely that in this war he was on neither side, to which he said that I could rest assured on that point. For 3 months or so afterwards, every week, the Harijan carried what I would call a neutrality article with regard to the War and an insistent demand for Indian freedom. This open town affair had also a minor sequence insofar as on the concluding day of the debate, he called me to him and said : You might laugh at my inner voice. I do not, I never did. But anyhow he started off with his inner voice and said that he had been pondering the idea and that last night he woke up at two in the morning, which was an inconvenience I hated to cause him. He said that finally he wrote out a letter to the Viceroy, Lord Linlithgow, I think and showed me the letter. The letter was very clear. Gandhiji had called me a socialist with pronounced leanings towards non-violence. He had then gone on to say that I had approached him to get Indian cities declared open. I told Gandhiji that the letter was perfectly alright but could he not in some slight way indicate that he had also approved of the idea, to which he said that he could not. I then said, why should the Viceroy react to my idea, after all who am I ? What can I do ? But if he accepted it even in a partial

measure, he would think twice before replying to his letter, to which Gandhiji very rightly said that I was wrong. The mere fact that Gandhiji wrote a letter embodying the idea would indicate to him that the reply had to be made after serious consideration, which was perfectly alright and satisfied me. But unluckily there was another person in the room, who said, look, Bapu, you only are handing him over to the British police by writing this letter and that of course was an end to it. The letter was not sent because that was a conclusive argument with Gandhiji, I tried my very best to tell him that he need not fear on that score because the British would arrest me anyway and whether I got arrested as a consequence of that letter or two or three months afterwards would not really matter. But no argument persuaded Gandhiji and he did not send that letter.

During that period, I had also wanted him to make an approach to be governments of the world, as many as possible, with a scheme of setting up the foundations on which the new world could be built. If I do not distake, the four bases I had outlined were : 1. Cancellation of all past investments by one country in another. 2. Unobstructed passage and right to settlement to everybody all the world over. 3. Political freedom of at the peoples and nations of the World and constituent assemblies. 4. I kink it is some kind of a world citizenship. All imperial investments must is concelled and perfect freedom to anybody to settle anywhere one liked must prevail. The Indian people and the government of India must now be bold enough to declare to the whole world that anybody can come here and settle down and do what he or she likes. All these outdated and barbarous notions of citizenship, which shut up one territory against large masses of the world, must be given up, but as everybody knows we are too far away from that. Australia is barred, Russia is barred, America is barred and, of all fanciful countries, even India is barred. If one were to look at various laws regarding foreigners and their travelling round India or their settling down in this country of their visas, we are just as barbarous as any other country. If anybody should think that our living standards would be depressed if foreigners came to our country and pursued various vocations, I have only this to say that our living standards are so depressed that to think in those terms may be alright for a Russian or an American but an Indian at least must make a new

departure and assert for himself and his people that no country in the world is a secure territory for any one race. Some day, I suppose, these principles will be observed, some day when we are strong enough to throw open our own doors to everybody and when we may be strong enough to knock at the doors of Australia or Siberia or California.

This was the essence of the four principles I enunciated . . . . As a statement of principles, there was nothing to which he could take objection, but as a mode of approach he did perhaps on the ground that it would not result in anything at all. Gandhiji was not a person who only thought out schemes of re-construction but one who worked these schemes out. He rejected the idea of approaching the world's governments, probably because he felt he would not cut much ice with them. It was a case of caution and perhaps too much caution. After all, men like me who have no reputation to lose can go about saying things. But, after all leaders and great leaders have to be fairly cautious in their steps. Perhaps it was bad. But Gandhiji did endorse the suggestion in his Harijan, endorsed it completely, after reproducing the suggestion in full, which would indicate that on world issues he had as broad and open a mind as any body ever had. He believed in a concept of world citizenship, which would do away with national, racial, caste and class barriers of citizenship. He also believed that every people must be free enough to decide its fate and its affairs in its Senates and its Legislatures and, further that every people must start its free life in an unencumbered fashion, because most peoples of the world who have suffered foreign rule have a whole weight of accumulated debts upon them, the imperial investments, which they have paid out over and over again, they start their new life with an intolerable burden. This is as far as the war goes.

There was an incident about Sir Stafford Cripps, who had come and gone. It was 1942 and I wrote on the mystery of Gripps, something which was not very pleasant, during which a sentence occurred that a need of the British State is to maintain the British Empire. The British State in England, the English people, need to have the British Empire for themselves for their very existence : the British Empire is the need of the British State. After reading that out, the whole of my essay, Gandhiji pointed his finger at that and said : What do you exactly mean by this sentence ? I

said that even if the British people ever realised the correctness of Indian aspirations, it would not be possible for them to undertake any steps in furtherance of that realisation. He said, why ? I said because England, with density of population that she had achieved, would not be in a position to maintain herself with current living standards if she had to forego the British Empire, particularly the Empire in India. Gandhiji said : can't they go out to Australia or Canada ? To which I said that as soon as an Englishman goes out to Australia or Canada and settles down there he ceases to be a British citizen. He became an Australian or a Canadian and to that extent the British State diminishes and therefore I could not quite see how the British State would agree to a considerable removal of its citizens to another territory and thereby also to diminish its own power. This was the traditional political thinking. I was not being very original. This is how the world has gone on and I felt that every State has a motive for its existence. That motive may not be consciously realised by everybody but then it is ever expressed and I thought that the British State was motivated by this intense passion to maintain itself, to further itself, but never to diminish itself. And if that be so, how could it be that Britian would agree to the diminishing of her Empire and to the release of India from her control. After the conversation had lasted a long while, Gandhiji said, that may be so, but I will work on the assumption that it is possible for England to release India from her control. Now that is a sentence that I would like to remember. "That may be so, but I will work on the assumption that it is possible for England to release India". And therewith hangs the whole story of change of heart, which is a phrase that has very often been abused not only by critics of Mahatma Gandhi but also by his admirers and followers. If some have looked upon it as an instrument to deny the revolution, others have actually used it so that it has checkmated the revolution. In both cases, admirers as well as critics have reduced the phrase, change of heart, to such mimic proportions that it bears no relationship whatsoever to Mahatma Gandhi's own conception of life. His followers have turned it into a fanciful notion of trusteeship. American capitalism has produced trustees, than whom it would be difficult to imagine better donors or creators of foundations. Some of these donations and foundations are for the most radical causes on earth. But all this does not

change the character of capitalism Gandhiji himself after nearly thirty years of strenuous exercise in the theory of trusteeship, was able to produce jtst one man, one whose death I wrote that he was a trustee in consumption, a capitalist in production and half-trustee and half-capitalist in bequeathing. I do not know whether Gandhiji's belief in trusteeship was weak or his sense of fairness and search for truth was strong, but he printed in his Harijan my rejection of his concept of the trustee. Furthermore, Gandhiji spent just about a year of his life changing the heart of Smuts, Irwins and Birlas, while he devoted over forty years to putting courage into and thereby changing the hearts of tens of millions of people all the world over. It would be wrong to deny or forget the relative worth of either activity. What stands out in all this is Gandhiji's assumption that man can be good, exen though he is almost certain to be bad in some situations

What this assumption had to do with the eventual British expulsion from India is anybody's guess. There were as many dead in India's non-violent fight as in any violent struggles and more, if the deaths of the partition are included, as they should be, furthermore, the British withdrawal from India was coupled with one of the worst trickeries of human history, India's partition. In any event, Indonesia, Burma, Ghana or Vietnam have achieved freedom without non-violence and without Gandhiji's assumption. Nevertheless, any sane man should subscribe to Gandhiji's belief in man, not because it is correct or scientific, but because it forms the foundation for a new world.

Gandhiji had been wanting to take away that power, which today belongs to the capitalist and which enable him to command the lives of millions and tens of millions, and to entrust it to society a whole. Whether that society should be thought of in terms of an organisation ruled from a centre like Delhi or a society in which centres of power are distributed into numberless villages as also districts and provinces and the centre is another question. I for one do not believe in a centralised direction of public ownership, because I believe that a socialist minister can become just as tyrannical as any group of private capitalists, if he has the economy of the whole country to direct from one centre, whether Delhi, Peking, Washington or Moscow. But if, after the property of capitalists is taken away from them, in due proportion consigned to various agencies of society like village, district, town, province

and centre, I believe that ideas of freedom, equality as of trusteeship can be worked out.

Let no one imagine that I for a moment deem it possible to change the heart of the capitalist, at least not fully. If Gandhiji could not change the heart of a single capitalist beyond producing that half-trustee and half-capitalist, who am I to make such an aspiration ? Is it just not possible. But, then, let us not make the mistake of confusing this impossibility of changing the heart of the capitalist in order to destroy the capitalist system with a partial change of the capitalist heart. You may not be able to change the capitalist : you may not be able to persuade him to give up the capitalist system. In fact, if you do succeed in persuading him give up the capitalist system, you will have persuaded him into bankruptcy, because so long as this system prevails, if a capitalist ceases to be a capitalist, he must turn into a bankrupt. He will begin distributing his capital as wages or something else and then he will cease to be a capitalist. But the capitalist system will not end that way. However, what can be done is that, if the army against capitalism is taught to battle with the weapons of love and anger and not those of fear and hate, it is possible that even a capitalist system may not counter those weapons, that battle, with the weapons of cruelty and tyranny that it has so far used. And, what is more decisive and possible, the mass of the people may find greater scope for exercising the majesty of their will. Sometimes this majesty is obstructed, other weapons come into being bitterness and fanaticism prevail and the majesty of people's will is blocked, it is not expressed. With a scheme such as I have outlined, in fact is an interpretation of change of heart, which I don't know whether it fits in with Gandhiji's an appropriate form of struggle will have to be evolved. Some persons will say that I am trying to put my interpretation into Gandhiji's change of heart. To that I would say that does not worry me. Whether I can substantiate it out of Gandhiji's writings and actions, quote chapter and verse, for such an interpretation is wholly irrelevant to me. What is relevant to me is this. *Is it possible for us to embody the essential part of Gandhiji's teachings in a mechanism of struggle that we might solve for ourselves* ? This is what I have to say with regard both to change of heart and trusteeship. There were other such incidents, but I will go on to the time when Lord Mountbatten proposed his solution for the

Indian question, the partition of the country. Let me in a very summary fashion tell you that there were any number of riots occurring all over the country, whether in Calcutta, or Punjab or elsewhere. Both Hindus and Muslims had turned into beasts, there was no other word for it, and either seemed to be excelling the other in evil practices. At that time, something had happened to Goa, and I had done something there and then Gandhiji even without taking me as to what had been done or how it had been done immediately turned a statement supporting my action, which was of course a very great to a very generous act, as he knew nothing about it. He told me later done read of my arrest in Goa at about 10 o'clock in the morning and about 12 o'clock he had already condemned my arrest and given his support to the movement. But then he added with a little touch of regret or complaint that, although I did not tell him what I planned to do, he tried to do his duty. I told him that I had not known as to what I would later do in Goa and, in fact and I told him so, I had not the faintest notion. I had gone there to meet a friend, Julias Menezes, and on the 3rd or 4th day of my stay in his house all kinds of people, students, policemen, teachers, businessmen, government servants and everybody came to me and said that they had no civil liberties and that they could not even print wedding invitations without prior approval of the police and so on and so forth. Gandhiji used to react in that fashion, whether it was a movement in Goa or one in Nepal and he extended his generous support without delay or ado. The background of his reasoning may well have been that, once a man proves his likeability, one assumes that his acts will be more good than evil. He had begun to like me and he assumed that my acts would be more good than evil. That put me under some kind of an obligation and so, when he insisted upon my staying on in Calcutta, I first resisted knowing fully well that I was incapable of doing anything whatsoever with regard to the bloody riots between Hindu and Muslims, but on the third or fourth day I succumbed and said alright I will stay on.

Until I had agreed there was not the slightest mention of what I was to do. I did not ask him that question nor did he tell me what to do. Then I finally agreed and said to him, I do not want to ask you that question, but anyhow what do you want me to do? He said he did not have to tell me what to do. I should do

what I thought best, I should just stay on in Calcutta. And, then he added almost as an after-thought : I would want you to find out your Muslim friends and visit them in their homes and renew your friendship with them. This may appear to be a very simple, a very minor and ordinary prescription. But it was not. If one recalls those days, when whole towns were split up into embattled partitions, one belonging to Muslims and another to Hindus, one would understand how difficult it would be for a Hindu to go into a Muslim mohalla or a Muslim to go into a Hindu mohalla. Actually, for a whole long year, there were markets in the no man's land between two warring mohallas. After all, no matter how much they rioted, there had to be deals and exchanges perhaps, some bartering of eggs and clothes, and so Hindus and Muslims would come from their respective mohallas and leave their baskets of goods and commodities in the no man's land. There would be a specific time for one group and then the other group would come and gather their baskets and leave the other goods for them. It is so fantastic. They slit open each other's throats but, with regard to trading of commodities, they seemed to be very punctilious and honest and in the no man's land, exchange took place very well. This was the situation. I had a number of Muslim friends in Calcutta from earlier times and I tried to look them up. But whenever I sent some persons to their houses I got back the inevitable reply that the man had either left Calcutta or was not at home or that he would come along and nobody turned up. And this went on until after the fifth or sixth day when I got disgusted with myself. I had not met a single Muslim in his own house, so that I started out without prior notice or appointment. I had not imagined the excitement that took place, when I entered into that Muslim mohalla. Before relating the whole story let me state that when I returned I found at least 200 to 300 Hindus assembled beyond the no man's land, waiting expectantly to find out as to what had happened to us. When I walked in, I felt, a very surcharged atmosphere. Some faces looked so violent and I can quite understand that. If a Muslim had walked into a Hindu mohalla in that fashion, I suppose he would have drawn the same angry looks. Whether it was some kind of a fear within me, whenever I saw a face of that kind, I smiled. That was all I did and, if it was too angry a face, I sometimes asked him as to where this particular person I wanted

to visit lived. I must say that this little sentence from me would considerably lighten the atmosphere. After all we are human beings and if you met a person with a smile and with a frank and normal question, you are in and to get a fairly human reaction, I will not say in all the hundred cases.

It may well have been that this humanity would have failed and well then I would not be here to make this speech to you. But it worked and some of them were so good as to show part of the way to me and there was one young boy who took me to my destination, a house which was then serving as the centre for Muslim students in Calcutta. I had a two-hour conversation with those students almost in the same fashion or perhaps exactly, as I would have talked to Hindu students, because once inside that house all my in embarrassment was gone. I was perfect master of myself. Those young students I could not in any way distinguish from any other group of Hindu students that I might have talked to. They put me blunt questions. They asked me if I agreed with Mr. Jayaprakash Narayan's contention that Mr. Jinnah was a traitor or a Mir Jafer. I know it was a question surcharged with emotional fury, but then I had to return an honest answer. I said, as although I had never used the word nor would I like to, and I gave explanations at which some of these students were very angry and they said too thought so, well; they too thought me to be a traitor. I said that was precisely what I had come to know about and if they liked they could take me as traitor and, then, of course, these young men tried to put forward a condition. They said that if we accepted the idea of Pakistan, then, they and we would fight the Birlas and the Ispahanis together. Young people in their enthusiasm thought of this way out. But I must say this : There was considerable argument and fury and heat and all that, but it was a normal kind of debate taking place between a group of students who were rather tumultuous at times and a person who was 10 or 15 years older and therefore commanded some little respect and attention. I was very flattered when one of them said : why is it that our University professors do not come to visit us as you have done, although we are often beleaguered here, and also mentioned some other local leaders, to which I said : well, I do not know, in fact, I may not have come myself but for Gandhiji's idea, I had a number of similar experiences, though not exactly like this. They

are part of Gandhiji's story, for they might not have happened but for him. It was a very minor and simple prescription : and, when I first heard it little could I understand its total meaning : visit your Muslim friends in their homes. This prescription was charged with all the passion of those times but also its canalising into the right direction. This prescription was also worked out by a friend of mine, Satin Mitra, and he died in one such effort. Many persons have died in that fashion and, however much we may be pained by such deaths, what matters is the outlook on life and it is beastly to have frontiers and a no-man's land in one's own country. I wonder what would have happened if not tens or hundreds but thousands had worked out that prescription, not fitfully, but regularly. On the 15th of August, 1947, there was tumultuous rejoicing, when both Hindus and Muslims started embracing each other, and, for a moment, all the accumulated bitterness and fanaticism of a year and more was gone and all the mohallas were open to each other. We organised an all-night procession, after celebrating the advent of independence at mid-night, and the idea as far as I recollect came to me on the spur of the moment. The procession broke down all barriers. . . .

I had a talk with Gandhiji, a fairly full one, in the morning and he asked me to see him again in the evening, for he had something very important to talk to me about. What else could one have thought in those days, the Mountbatten days ? So, I went over in the evening after he had finished his prayers and had part of his walk. He asked everybody to leave him and then resumed his walk with his hand on my shoulders and started off a conversation, which I had long stopped expecting from him. I had then known about my way of life and therefore it came to me as a surprise when he started off by talking to me about my cigarettes, my tea and my coffee. After 13 years of rather long and intimate conversations with Gandhiji, I least expected that I would be asked to listen to a private talk on cigarettes. I smoked them and he said that I smoked too much and that I drank lot too much coffee and tea and went off on a long dissertation on how ruinous it was to the health of a person if he drank lot too much coffee and tea and how ruinous it was to health to smoke cigarettes, beyond that he went on to give me prescriptions from China and Japan as to how I should, gradually give up my habit of smoking or drinking tea, beyond that he went on to say that

this was a problem linked up with socialism and the rest of it. He said that as a socialist I must identify myself with the people, that I must become their spokesman, so it was a process of identification and spokesmanship, the two together and then he asked me on what grounds could I possibly justify my cigarette smoking in India, which debarred me from completing this process of identification with and spokesmanship of my countrymen, the mass of hungry and proverty-stricken.

I have had very few such embarrassing moments in my life. His hand was on my shoulder and so I could not have moved away even if I so wished and all that I could do was to listen to him, then he asked me if I had nothing to say. I kept quite, but he was not deterred, because he was not a great man in the ordinary sense of the term, and so even when I did not at all reply to his questions, which was thoroughly rude on my part, he moved out into another dissertation on how a spokesman of the people should live. Then a second time he asked me if I had anything to say ? Again, I said nothing. Then he asked me if I wanted him to stop ? I asked him to continue. Then he asked me if I drew such a water-tight distinction between private and public life and wanted him to concern himself only with my public life ? To that, I said, in the first place I did not draw such a distinction, at least not quite in that water-tight way. Of course, I would draw some distinction but not quite in the sense of public life and private life being two wholly separate divisions, so that one could do in one's private life what one condemned in one's public life. That would be a thoroughly ridiculous proposition, so, I said, I did not make such a distinction and, even if I would object to others, I certainly would not do so in his case and that he had complete liberty to tell me all he liked about anything under the sky.

So he went off again and then finally I had to give him an answer, the nearly 45 minutes of gruelling, and I said, I do not give you an answer today but I shall give you an answer soon enough. I do not know whether Gandhiji's argument is right or not. To this day, I do not know, whether the process of identification with and spokesmanship of the people entails a conduct quite in Gandhiji's style.

It may, it may not. But after having been asked to do a thing in such insistent fashion, after another two months or so.

I told Gandhiji that I have given up smoking. I gave up smoking and I did not smoke again until the day that Gandhiji was assassinated. It is a sad story to tell of a man and his way of thought. Quite honestly, on the morrow of the day that he was assassinated, I felt that he had betrayed me and my countrymen by going away so soon. What obligation did I still have not to smoke ? Some such ridiculous notion came to my mind. With a great man wanting one to do a certain thing aided by number of arguments, although one may not be wholly in agreement with them, under the influence of that man and the loyalty one has to him, a certain self-discipline starts. That has also something to do with the reconstruction of humanity.

. . . . Gandhiji asked me once. Did I belive in God ? It was a pretty late state for such a question, as I had known Gandhiji for many years and he had never asked it earlier. Many questions that I should have asked I did not, for, like a fool, I was confident that he would live on and on. Not that I would have ever raised any silly questions, becouse after all I did not require his guidance in such problems as to whether I should keep my hands on the shoulder, of a girl I happened to know. I am not the kind of person who would go with such a problem to him and ask his opininon. I would do it if I felt it the right thing to do or put my arm round her waist, or, if she feels like putting her arm, which rarely happens, around my waist or, I would say, alright go ahead. It is not necessarily a gesture of love or desire. Do not for a moment think that it is only out of love or lust that such things are done. Their source may be just companionship, I mean, as I might put my hand on the shoulders of a male friend. What matters it to another if two males or two females or one male and one female put their hands on each other's shoulders. Anyhow, he said : do you believe in God ? I said, I did not.

Then Gandhiji said it was doubtful whether I could really be a good satyagrahi, if I did not believe in God. Also, he added that one did not know. Everyone has his own way and I might best achieve my satyagraha without God and so he dropped the subject and never raised it again. There was this small but deciding admission. One does not know. Everyone has his own way. As far as I was concerned. I gave my answer that I did not. However, I am not impertinent enough to consider myself superior to those who do believe in God. Everyone has his own

way. And I have seen people, who believe in God, ordinary people, who get such solace and peace out of visiting a mosque, a temple or a church, that I would be the last person to deny them that. For, they look entranced and on their faces is a delight, which it is totally outside my power to give to them. Who am I to become a bar to that is. Of course, if it ties up perversely with other questions in which we are interested, with social ordering and political affairs, I would certainly combat it.

. . . I would like to say something of when he fasted in Calcutta on an occassion of Hindu-Muslim rioting. India was declared free and a Congress government sat in the saddle. One thing was clear. Gandhiji's house was a better clearing house of information than the intelligence offices of the Bengal Government. Bengal's Chief Minister once detailed to Gandhiji stories of rioting, which had already been brought to him several hours earlier. That was most annoying and I could not repress myself. On such occasions, a faint smile of indulgence and resignation used to flicker on Gandhiji's face. But the situation grew increasingly tense. It was impressed on me that Gandhiji might give up his fast earlier, if unlicensed weapons used for rioting were surrendered to him. Some of these weapons had been left over from days of the open rebellion. The users in some cases were the same. These men had travelled from the national struggle to the religious struggle and some of them at least, so it was thought, might still listen to me in some emergent situation. These men were brave in their own way, at least not easily unnerved. One of them was believed to have sten-gunned nearly as score of persons to death at a single session without flickering an eyelid.

Some of these former nationalists were still in contact with me and their religious patriotism was therefore kept in check. Some others had given themselves up wholly to the religious struggle. When it came to surrender of weapons, I was manouvered into a situation of having to exercise my influence on a heretic disciple rather than a pliant one. The pliant disciples were clever. They excused themselves on the plea that their weapons were not easily available. The heretic, so I think, was more truthful and, thought a little difficult at the beginning, knew the meaning of words, or at least such words as concerned Gandhiji and I, his former leader spoke to him. Jagmohan Bose, known among his friends as Jagga and whom I called Jaggu,

acknowledge me at once and, so it appeared to me, was placed in a difficult situation of conscience. I had three meetings with him in the course of twelve hours, two which I remember distinctly but the third I am deducting. He was apparantly obligated to talk some one else into the act of surrender, this person being either the financier of the general orgrniser for the city. Jaggu is a very brief talker, at least was. He asked me if the surrender was absolutely essential and if it had a direct bearing on Gandhiji's life. I told him, that was so. He asked me, if that was my own opinion I told him, that was so. That made up his mind for him. I have rarely had such touching obedience to my judgment. At some stage, a hitch had apparently occured. Jaggu asked me if the thing could not be done the next day. I told him, no, we should not take such risks with Gandhiji's life or put him under a difficult strain. To this man of few words, each word was worthy of attention and had a meaning. Was it the occassion, was it that his former leader spoke, was it because Gandhiji's life was involved or had a speeial quality of his own. It was a combination of all four, as later events have made abundantly clear.

Jaggu told me that to complete the mission, he would have to take me after dark to a friend, with whom I must do some talking. I was driven fast in an automobile through many winding lanes, perhaps repetitiously through the same lanes in an obvious attempt at precaution which was thoroughly unnecessary must have been forced on Jaggu by his friend. I was then led to an upper storey in a lift, which showed that I was visiting someone of means. After some minutes, a man came, one of the strangest characters I have ever met in my life. He seemed to be out of fiction-book of Chinese crime. He looked the heavy fared heavy-jowled Chinese of a minor Kingship, or of stories of smuggling, dopetrade and uttering of stolen goods or gold. I wonder whether I am imagining the moment's shiver that I remember to have experienced. The man shot a question at me. What is it that steadies men like me, is it something inside us or just habit arising out of having been through too many situations. I told him that I would very much like to know myself why I was there. The answer seems to have cut him to size. He launched an attack on what he called false nationalism and accused us of helping the Muslim to subjugate or destroy the Hindu. He asked me where the Hindus would get their weapons, should they need them again.

I told him that the hands of a person and the heart which moves them decide the issue, for they can obtain weapos when they so choose or even fight without them. The man gave up, with some mild curses on his lips, for Jaggu was on my side though silently. We collected that night a stengun, some hand-grenades and a few other explossives or firearms.

When a job is done, I often like to withdraw. The weapons were surrendered to Gandhiji by my friends and I stayed outside. Was it some reticence that held me back, either at the hour of the night, for It was almost midnight, so that Gandhiji might not have to talk too much or the desire not to degenerate a drama into melodramatics ? We felt like relaxing and chose to drive up to the general post office around eight miles away. On the way, it struck me that the hand-grenades were live. We hastened back, and my friends entered Gandhiji's room once again in order to pot the grenades into a bucket of water. Jaggu now owns a small printing press and I gather that his bodyguard value with some government ministers is not too low. We meet but rarely, once in three years or four. The last time he met me, he tried to persuade me into the Congress party, with that economy of meaningful words which is his characteristic. I do not blame him. Who knows if he may not be right and progress in the mass may not after all be a very up and down business. But should he be wrong, I do not blame him either. Most brave men are brave only in patches and the rest of the time they seem to store up energy or they flame up only once to be cinders ever afterwards.

If Jaggu is now humdrum, he is so honestly, simply, and without pretension, and a part of me lives in him and his like. I had once likened Gandhiji's heart to a sieve, full of holes and new ones ever pricked into it, when one of his disciples died. Politics prick holes into the heart, not only when colleagues die but also when they stop the journey, particularly if they have been disciples.

Too many of my disciples have found the road rough going. But as many are still there and more. Kedar Raut and Anil Ghoshai, whom I had tent to keep Gandhiji company in Noakhali and do his bidding, are still there and a third, Bhupen Roy, has stayed back in Pakistan and, even if he idles most of the time, who would not like him in his simple and hilarious humanity, not without courage. I think also of Rambabu Saha, who with three others refused to run away and tried to form a protective

ring around me, when we were assailed with bricks and stones in Chittagong, and who is still refusing to crop out, although there are few people who manage to irritate me more. Padamsingh's name is insistent, perhaps because of the amusing memory when Gandhiji offered to have a chair brought for him because of his trousers, a form of dress about which there is another anecdote, but also because of his Opel, which needed two men to close its door and had once caused big merriment among the crowd as the socialist car as it came immediately after Sardar Patel's and Padam too has refused to drop out. We who lived in Gandhiji's shadow have not much reason to complain even after his death, for the good probably outweighs the evil.

27

GANDHI'S BLEMISH

RAMMANOHAR LOHIA

As I intend to write something nasty about Gandhiji, let me first put things in a proper perspective. I still believe that he probably belongs to the class of myth-makers like Rama and Krishna and his like was not born since Gautam the Buddha. But all such judgments are so personal and contemporary that I am also somewhat suspicious about this particular one. Gandhiji cannot be absolved of the guilt of Hindustan's partition in 1947.

Gandhiji had said that partition would be effected only on his dead body. He died only after the partition. He did not die fighting the partition. Between the partition and his death, there lies a period of less than 6 months. But these 6 months are crucial to the history of the country.

Between the two rocks of accusation and defence truth is bashed up. Gandhiji's defenders can quote reams from his speeches and writings to prove that he did not favour the partition, that, in fact, he tried to oppose it and that it came very much against his will. But the essential point is whether this will was active or passive in the ultimate stages of Britain's withdrawal from India. All defence put up on Gandhiji's behalf lies in shambles against the single question of why his will became passive when the moment of decision came, and why he did not actively oppose the partition when it came.

I am not Gandhiji's accuser. I do not hold him as a primary culprit for the country's partition, in the manner that Mr. Jinnah,

Mr. Nehru and Sardar Patel were, but his secondary guilt is there for all to see. Among the primary culprits were of course the vast impersonal forces of history, the decadence of Hindus since the disintergation of Kanouj, the blind self-defeating fanaticism of India's Islam, the last perfidy of British imperialism, and above all the object spirit of surrender and accommodation which goes by the name of synthesis and tolerance and which is due primarily to caste.

One can up to a point understand Messers Nehru and Jinnah. Aside from being hungry for power, they were not men of wisdom of foresight. They could not have possibly foreseen the consequences of partition, the butchering of nearly a million of men, women and children not in armed encounters, but the way animals are killed, and the uprooting of nearly 20 million men from their homes. Precisely that a tenth of such massacre should not happen was the best argument for partition, the thing that predisposed the country's vast population to accept it. Gandhiji was a man of wisdom and foresight, also because he was not a man of narrow self-interest. Why did this foresight forsake him at that point of time ? He had indeed foreseen disturbances. But I am not quite sure that he foresaw them on the colossal scale that they actually took place. If he did, his guilt would be unforgivable. It is in fact already unforgivable. Other words would have to be used for his behaviour if indeed he did foresee the colossal scale of partition's butchery. That butchering and uprooting is still working itself out in the temper of the people on both sides of the frontier, in the histories, of India as well as Pakistan. The leader must foresee.

Why did Gandhiji not put up a fight against the partition ? The argument that he would have had to fight colleagues of a whole life time makes no sense. Partition of the country was not an occasion on which the opinion of colleagues or even of ones whole organisation could be decisive. It is true that Gandhiji was unable to create a mass fervour against partition inspite of his daily prayer speeches before it actually took place. But there was a quality of equivocation in his speeches. The masses rise not when the leader is of two minds and tongues on an issue. I am also prepared to concede that something was lacking in the younger leadership of the Congress Party, that Gandhiji had successively probed us in his own way and found us wanting.

The essential point again lies elsewhere. What would have happened if Gandhiji had actively opposed the partition ? Could Mr. Nehru rule over India and Mr. Jannah over Pakistan with Gandhiji killed by either of them or in jail ? The killing did in fact take place, but how tragic was its timing. Aside from the tragedy, that violence put an end to the life of the apostle of non-violence, the tragedy of ill-timing is probably even greater.

The nation would have shed its abject spirit of surrender and accommodation, miscalled the culture of synthesis. which it had acquired through 15 centuries of history, in that one moment of sacrifice at the alter of partition. And indeed who knows if partition would not have been avoided altogether with only Gandhiji in jail or threatening to be there.

Some kind of a commission is trying to fix the responsibility and guilt for Gandhiji's death. Partition of the country and Gandhiji's murder are two sides of the same coin. To investigate one side without at the same time investigating the other is stupid waste of time.

The school of Oriental and African studies in England has appointed some kind of a commission to enquire into the partition, and presumably the guilt for it most of all. Millions of pounds are believed to be at the disposal of this commissions. The British cherish their reputation. They know well that history can be rewritten and India's history without any difficulty. No oceans or perfumes are needed to wash away the spots of blood.

The British Government has decided to release all papers relating to their withdrawal from India. Some noted British historian and committees will indeed supervise the release and do some editing when necessary. The British do indeed love their reputation, The India government or sections of it may mean while be destroying some papers in the foolish hope that smirches an evidence of crime will thereby be removed. In any case, these papers are strictly secret property for the native student of historian.

Why did not Gandhiji resist the partition ? I will hazard a guess about a cause sowewhat midway between the vast enduring forces of India's history and immediate matters of detail such as Gandhiji's old age. India's struggle for freedom depended almost entirely on the clever phrase, the wonderful formula, the intelligent or florid argument and, of course, the incohate will of the people

to be free. Gandhiji was superb at maintaining and continuing the will to freedom and also at the intelligent argument. But he did not organise this will. He had no lieutenants to do so. His own method and mode were perhaps not too favourable to the organising of this will.

Superficially this would appear to be a silly thought. Gandhiji was after all the builder of one organisation after another. He built the Charkha Sangh, The Village Industries Association, The Talimi Sangh, The Harijan Sangh, The Adimjati Sangh and similar other uplift organisations. Not one of these organised or steeled this will for freedom. They were at best keep-busy organisations and bulwark against indolence or despair. To say that these organisations did not steel men in their fight for freedom is not to deny their importance in other ways.

Even the Congress was hardly a fighter's organisation. It was indeed a mass organisation. It could even be called upto a point a class organisation of the peasantry. But the mode and basis of its organisation, was such that its strength depended on the people's desire for freedom as well as the lawyer's clever formula. It could never reach up to the ideal of non-co-operation with evil. It stopped at civil disobedience and that too relatively of the few. A main cause may have been the character of the higher echelons of its leadership, middle class, high caste and mostly men of moderate substance with a little unease and anxiety about their future.

Non-violence and non-co-operation may have been at the root of it. They are not conducive to a short fight and a quick victory, nor do they permit the intermittent pleasure of having the enemy's head bashed however less frequently that ones own. Peasants, workers, students and similar groups organised to wage their class fights can with a radical ideology and a favourable turn of events successfully rush at the enemy.

Gandhiji was not an ordinary leader. He held the people in the palm of his hands. No leader in recorded history has wielded such power over his people without occupying a seat of authority. Lenin as the chairman the presidium was certainly more powerful than Gandhiji, but, before the successful outcome of the Russian revolution, he was no where near Gandhiji in his power over the people.

No leader with such power over the people dare ask for

understanding or forgiveness over a major error. If it is in the nature of non-violence and non-co-operation that its reality should fall far short of its ideal. India's recent most tragedy makes some sense. India was some kind of a sacrificial lamb for the world as a whole, but then we have to presuppose that Gandhiji will win out against the nuclear bomb as well as the conventional gun. But speculations about the possibilities and forms of non-co-operation must continue; who knows if Gandhiji was not somewhat inadequate in the organising of his own methods and weapons.

Let us however assume that the organisation of non-co-operation could have been no better. Let us assume that the open rebellion of 1942, the promise of the Indian section of the British Air Force to come over the people's side at the next out break, the Azad Hind Fauz, the post war Navy Rebellion, the day and night long squatting of hundreds of thousands of people against prohibitory orders and similar events and attitudes could not have culminated into a successful people's Rebellion for a Free Hindustan. Let us finally assume that Gandhiji would have stood lovesome in his fight against partition of the country. That single act of faith and will might well have given the people a new religion of collective behaviour.

To this day most Hindus justify the guilt of Rama in banishing Sita. A cruel and seneless act, the culpability of double punishment for an offence that was not committed are sought to be justified in the fair name of democracy, a democracy that had lost all content and was turned into cheap clap-trap.

There is no danger of Gandhiji turning like Ram into God on earth. His blemish in regard to partition deserves to be studied in greater detail. Even if all else had failed, his will should not have. Why it failed has been touched upon here in some of its facets. What is more important is that if it had not failed it would have changed the people, the nation, the country and the world, as no other act since the crucification of Christ. Gandhians would have to learn to be more active willed than Gandhiji himself. Their acts of faith and will may not work miracles individually, because they are not leaders of men in the way Gandhiji was. Collectively and in the long run, these acts of will for equality and prosperity will work the change.

28

NAXALBARI, ASANSOL AND CALCUTTA

RAMMANOHOR LOHIA

The Naxalbari way of Communism is just about as meaningful as the Bhudan way of Sarvodaya. Birds of the same feather flock together, and that is why, Bhudan visitors to what has come to be known as the "free area" have discovered there an agrarian problem, as presumably also an agrarian solution. Before an enquiry into what this particular problem and solution is, I would like to think of what happened of their predecessors.

Once when land-lordism was abolished in various parts of the land, scribes, scholars and the Government, all claimed that the agrarian problem had been solved. A second time when millions of acres of land, presumably five to six millions, were received as land-gifts over a number of years with a fanfare publicity the world has rarely witnessed, and distributed to the agricultural labourer or the poor farmer, the land problem was finally solved. But the agrarian problem kept on recurring. A third time when various State Governments imposed a ceiling on land and, as a result, another two million acres of land were made available for re-distribution, nothing seemingly was left to solve over again. But reasoning and logic are in a bad way in our country. Whenever there is an effective noise, busy bodies go about trying to find what the problem is and how it is being solved. Once again, for the fourth time, the cry has gone up that there is a problem to be solved in Naxalbari although some persons are likely to remember that the problem and its solution are not quite

so new and they have seen it in a somewhat similar shape years ago in Telangana. They have been seeing it in Vietnam, and it is a matter of some regret that they never quite began to see it in Japan.

I will rely for my figures on the Calcutta weekly *Now*. Whatever else it might profess about itself, it is a sophisticated left-Communist weekly and oft readable. An immediate reason is that a dear old friend. Satyabrata Sen, whose nationalism and humanism have apparently, and somewhat understandably, succumbed to the cosmopolitan and libertarian temptations of this journal, sent me its Naxalbari clipping of 30th June, which led me on to its article of 7th July. According to it, agricultural labourers range about five per cent of the employed total in the "free" area. So it is not their play at all, not even a second or third role.

In Naxalbari, cultivators are put down at 37.5 per cent of the total, while those engaged in mining, forestry and plantation at 40 per cent. In the other disturbed areas, proportions vary considerably so that in Kharibari cultivators show around of 68 per cent, while mining etc. 15 per cent. The varying proportions show such a wide range that any generalisation alone on the basis of these figures would be incorrect. However, for Naxalbari, it is quite clear that cultivators and mining or planting labourers split almost evenly, in fact somewhat to the advantage of the latter. This fact is of the utmost importance, for the journal later tends to neglect it during its analysis. *Now* says : "The tribal (including the scheduled caste) population in the Siliguri sub-division cannot be held responsible for the explosive character of the present movement, for by far the largest group amongst them are employed in the non-farm sector (plantations, forests, etc.") We will presently show why and how they are responsible

Still more interesting figures follow. The proportion of cultivators possessing less than five acres of land in Naxalbari is put down at round 68 per cent of the total. In the two other Thanas of the "free" area, it varies at round 60 per cent and 44 per cent. With the kind of cultivation there is in our country, and the kind of labour that cultivators both owning and labouring put up in Bengal, anybody possessing less than 10 acres can he considered anything but poor alone by naive or wicked people. That would probably raise the figure of cultivators, to anywhere

between 80 and 90 per cent. But then the left-Communists have another argument to make.

In a table showing incidence of three types of holdings, one, own cultivation, two, share-cropping or Bhagchashi, three, both, the first type ranges between round 39 per cent and 27 per cent in all the three Thanas, the second, between 50 and 65 and the third between round 7 or 11. Share-cropping is undoubtedly very high. In an earlier table, though, the proportion of cultivators with agricultural labour as secondary occupation and the proportion of agricultural labourers with cultivation as secondary occupation has in Naxalbari been shown at a roughly equal percentage. The two other Thanas show some variation, but not enough so as to necessitate a different conclusion It is quite clear that in Naxalbari the two personalities of cultivator and agricultural labourer are more often than not merged in the same person. Where then does this land hunger come from. Who loots the land and whose land is being looted ? Unless the writer of this article, this writer is apparently a civilian able at the writing of notes and in the English language, has tried deliberately to conceal, his economic understanding does not match his skill at writing.

Without a doubt some 10 per cent of land holders own more than 20 acres of land each. Some of them might even be owning a 100 or a 500 acre. The latter figure is however exceedingly unlikely. Where tea planters and miners have grabbed land, not much is left for bigger landlords and in any case the various tables of the journal read jointly would tend to militate against that supposition. Amazingly neither issue of the journal records either the total acreage or the population involved. We are estimating population at round 40 thousand and the acreage at round 20 thousand.

If the main reason of the trouble in Naxalbari does not arise out of the conflict between the cultivator and the sharecropper, what then is it ? The journal says elsewhere "property complex being what it is in rural Indian, it is difficult to isolate caste from privileges", It is a most enlightening statement, coming as it does from a communist. If a socialist made it, it would be considered as one of his ordinary styles of thought and speech. Communism in this country is at least 10 years behind socialism in the understanding of the twin roles that caste and class play. In the present case however, the difficulty would have to be

expanded to cover not alone the isolation of caste from privileges but also that of caste from any kind of conflict. What follows now is more inference than evidence, inference based of course on an observation of Abhijit Roy Choudhry, SSP Secretary in West Bengal.

Cultivators are largely Rajbanshis. Agricultural, plantation and other labour is largely Santhal, Oraon, and Munda. Rajbanshis have been described as a scheduled caste, but this may well be an error, for the middle classes of Bengal do not quite understand the distinction between scheduled castes and backward castes. They are probably a backward caste. They are certainly the more original inhabitants of Naxalbari and North Bengal, an argument which the communist does not make use of because it does not go in his favour, but which he would have cried out from the house tops if it did. They are probably that group or caste of men who lived on the Famed northern way from the times of Ramayan and Mahabharta specially in the areas where Bihar ended and Bengal began. Passage of time has brought them down in the social scale. Plantation and other labour came into this area in the 70's of the last century to make profit for their British employer and incidentallv also the educated middle classes who accepted the so-called renaissance of the country under British aegis. These Santhals and others now out number the Rajbanshis. Although neither Rajbanshi nor Santhal is genuinely Bengali-speaking, Bengal's middle classes have largely succeeded in assimilating them.

The Tripura experience was a great shock to communism. They had once ruled the roost, insofar as a majority in some kind of a territorial council provides opportunities to rule. Recent general elections have transferred that rule to the Congress party. The cause for this change is Tribal versus Refugee, Communists were grounded in the tribals, who are now out-numbered more than two to one in Tripura. They are probably seeking to avenge their defeat, though in a somewhat awkward way. The Santhals among whom communists have formed their plantation trade unions out-number of Rajbanshis, but it is doubtful whether they out-number all the rest of the population.

The whole conflict become un-uhderstandable unless those engaged in mining, forestry and plantations are brought into the picture. The normal growth of population in these sections has

probably out-run the plantation and other capacity to absorb. Blood may have called unto blood, and the immigrants from other areas may have come. Why they are not grabbing tea plantation lands is a mystery. Every tea plantation in Bengal and Assam has an enormous surplus of unused land, which may will run into 1/3rd of the total.

Why this land is not being grabbed may be due to various factors. It might have led to early reprisals, and plantations may well be giving conscience money to the communist. Also, this conflict between labour and planter could not have created conditions of civil war, which alone, through combination of terror and temptation, eliminates the political opponent and brings all the poor under one banner. After all, there must be some among the Rajbanshis, who are rich by village standards or who can at least be denounced as such, some from East Pakistan or among the speakers of opportunities in mining or forestry from all over the land. Some of these must have bought their peace from the communists. Some others must be fighting for it. It is these others who probably give the struggle a deceptive look, that of the rich versus the poor which the communists are making use of for expansion of their party which naturally means to them the welfare of the people.

This thing of Naxalbari is far too bizarre to understand without the aid of extraneous factors. Mr. Mao Tse-tung may not have promised to come, but the local communists must certainly have thought that if they could stage a big enough up-rising, the great saviour of mankind would surely not long delay in coming. We do not think that Mr. Mao Tse-tung is coming, at least not just yet. That is why we are also unable to understand the cry of wolf from the other side. The communist attempt in Naxalbari is just as senseless and irrational as the anti-communist cry of wolf.

Anti-communism has a most pernicious habit. It begins to cry wolf at the slightest provocation. Or, perhaps, we do not understand the emotional importance of poverty to those who hold it. Often enough the fact is heavily borne on us that property however small is after all a man's best love, just as diamonds are a girl's best friend. At the remotest danger to property, which may be thoroughly unreal and just a vague generalised fear, holders of property begin to see red. This is reflected in the daily newspapers

which are owned by them. That again is reflected in day by day politics, which are largely influenced by what newspapers report. And then it is always nice to dramatise communism and any one of its exploits. The people can be more easily scared than if a socialist exploit were dramatised.

The cry of wolf is also somewhat difficult to understand in another context. Just one bridge, the Tiesta, connects the rest of the country with North Bengal and Assam. One ordinary light-weight conventional bomb is enough to blow up this bridge. The Chinese certainly know all about it. When they blow this bridge up, all land communications with North Bengal and Assam will go. Those who dramatise Naxalbari might dramatise as well the Tiesta bridge. If Naxalbari can give succor to advancing Chinese Armies, great succour will be given by the fact that the Government of India has been negligent in its duties and has not built up adequate land routes and bridges within the country. Why did't anti-Communist political parties, men of property and newspapermen dramatise the Tiesta Bridge? I concede that there is a difference between the possibility and scope of mischief in the two cases. The blowing up of the Tiesta bridge is repairable after a time. Expansion of Naxalbari might become irrepairable. The people in revolt might in that case atleast in certain areas welcome the advancing Chinese armies.

If I have pointed out the weaknesses in the anti-Communist arguments, I am not by a long shot an apologist of the Communist case. Communism is to me a bad doctrine and can in certain circumstances be a dangerous doctrine. The extra territoribility is obvious. Either Russia or China is their present temple. This argument may of course be controverted up to a point. Communism is no less nationalistic than any other doctrine, but it becomes so only after it has captured power and amassed some strength. Communist China was subservient to Russia for quite a long time. But it started hitting and kicking as soon as it had adequate strength. I do not of course deny the existence of the other type, namely, East Germany. They can never get away from the thraldom of Soviet Russia. They are far too small for that purpose. Whether Communist India, if ever, such a calamity were to happen, would be able to regain her independence in the way that China did after quite a long subservience to Soviet Russia or would remain tied to the apron strings of China, is a subject I

would not like to prophesize about.

More disconcerting is what is happening in the present than what might happen in the future. The doctrine of Communism necessitates borrowed living, borrowed thought, borrowed experience and there is very little scope for direct and immediate experience in it. That applies unfortunately to a very large extent to every doctrine prevalent in the world today. If Communist parties of both varieties live on experience borrowed from Russia or China, parties of the free world live on similarly borrowed experience from America, England, France or elsewhere. Man is reduced almost to an auto-maton Rabot, reacting not directly to the events what happened around him but indirectly through the mediation or such experience as he thinks his models have undergone.

I suppose it is this absence of immediacy of experience that leads Communists to lying on a scale probably more colossal than religion has ever done. Communist lies derive from the thought that end justifies means. Right in these articles on Naxalbari, we have evidence of this lying. The last time that we ever talked together, Mr. Nehru and I, was in 1951 when he telephoned me to inform me of the death of a common friend. Our last meeting had taken place several years earlier. We never met or talked again. Whatever talking was later done was across the floor in the Lok Sabha in full public sight and hearing, and yet Left Communists have to invent a telephonic conservation between Mr. Nehru and me in 1954 before the formation of the minority Socialist Ministry in Kerala. Friends drew my attention to similar lying when they read out passages to me from a book which had some such title as the American shadow over India. I am reported to have canvassed for South Korea against North Korea when war broke out between the two. This was wholly untrue. In fact, I had a somewhat rough quarrel with some of my colleagues over the stand to adopt for I did not want to take side and I did not think that the concept of collective security as expressed through the United Nations, was a proper instrument. I sometimes wonder whether my stand was even right, but in any case it was the opposite of what the book has said. I am also reported to have brought back to India some dollars from America for our election campaign in 1951-52. This again is wholly untrue, I was slightly amazed when Prof. Vargas, the most noted Soviet Economist and Historian on

Imperialism, repeated this lie in his book. I had thought that scholars, even communists, maintain some kind of a probity. But then all those who have forsaken living directly and immediately and who live on borrowed thoughts and experience find it so easy to resort to lie. They do not have any complex ideas to sort out in their own minds, any set of varigated experiences to integrate. All they need is to prove something which has already been proved to them through complete and exclusive enlightenment from a single foreign country or a single book and this they can best do by quoting all kinds of remarks and incidents, even if they are lies. In fact, so much the better if they are lies.

Killing is also an instrument, perhaps more so of Communism and similar faiths than of liberal doctrines. There is a lot of killing in wars or revolutions, practised all over the world, over all kinds of doctrines. But the kind of killing that is being done by Communists in order to eliminate trade unions and political opponents is of a different orders. It belongs to the events of the day and is not an occasional event of a century. I have not yet heard of a word of regret or grief from any noted Communist over the death of trade unionist Jha of Asanol. All that we have heard is tales of his having been a hired agent of the colliery owners or a hoodlum. We have also heard tales of how he sought to organise a procession into the Communist areas and in fact started the trouble. These are no arguments for killing a person. Even assuming that all what has been said about Jha by the Communists is true, that still does not give them the right to kill him. They should have striven instead to eliminate his hold upon the colliery workers and to put their own particular trade union in circulation. But this was probably found difficult. They therefore resorted to this heinous method. I am even prepared to concede that the killing may not have been entirely premediated. But there is not the slightest doubt that an event like this arises out of a certain mentality, the mentality that is prepared to establish the supremacy of what one considered right by all the means at one's disposal including killing.

I remember what Mr. Sam Berger, President Trumn's Political Representative in Greece told me of what he found of the trade union and the socialist movements in that country when he reached there. Greek Communists had eliminated around 150 trade unionists and Socialists leaders, so that there was nothing to build

on in the democratic way. I must say this for Truman and Berger that he was perhaps the first American President to make use of a working man as an overseas representative of his country and the other was not skilled and tenacious enough to build from scratch, and out of nothing a vital democratic movement. Killing in order to eliminate political and trade union opponents is an international habit of Communism, therefore, nothing extraordinary was practised in Asansol or Calcutta and I would also like to add that it is sometimes practised even by liberals and hnmanists although on the sly.

The disrobing of a Congress Parliamentarian in Calcutta is an event of similar quality, grossly vulgour and dehuman. This disrobed man was paraded through a street of his area, I hope not for a very long distance. Communist journals do not seem to attach any importance to such incidents. They do not mention them. They do not discuss them. If they do, they only point out the causes which according to them justify these events.

A pernicious element seems to have entered the Indian mind. It was not always there and I hope it will now fade away. To anti-Communists, who are continually talking about the Asansol murder or the Calcutta disrobing. I would like to talk of what happened in the recent past under the Congress rule. Do they not remembes that some workmen and managers were thrown alive into Jessop furnaces ? Do they not remember that Hindi speaking hut-dwellers who keep cows and buffalloes and carry on the trade of milk were set upon, their huts destroyed in fire and cattle along with them and one of the decapitated heads of a man was used as a foot ball ? Not all of such work was the doing of Communists or fellow-travellers. A lot of them must have been done by anti-Communists or atleast non-Communists. What has been the nature of Hindu-Muslim rioting throughout the last century up to the present. There has never been a pitched battle in which both sides took part manfully in an exercise of slaughter. Always a bigger crowd has set upon as a smaller crowd, perferably a lone individual or two and done the killing. Like wild beasts, men have pounced upon men so to say from behind without giving the victim any chance to fight back. This has been a special characteristic of the Indian mind in recent centuries, a mind so utterly debased and cruel, so utterly dehuman and beastly, that it is a matter of great amazement with thinkers and political parties have not struggled

with it. I wonder whether European or American Communism would have been as silent on the Asansol or Calcutta affairs as India's Communism has been. I am not for a moment suggesting that the Indian mind does not live in other spheres. That is precisely the trouble, that it lives in two worlds, one so cruel and inhuman and the other so non-violent and human as to be divine. As a doctrine of end justifying means, Communism has found its habitat in precisely this cruel and inhuman Indian mind, or perhaps a better nurture of its more undesirable aspects.

If this is what we think of Communists, the question is often asked why we associate with them. Do these questioners care to find out what we think of the Congress party and even of ourselves ? This is a relative world and although both personal behaviour and impersonal issues matter, the latter matters more. Communism is a maggot that breeds and thrives on the Congress dung-heap. So, obviously, the first duty should be to sweep away the dung-heap. Furthermore, no man is wholly an insect or an animal, and whether maggots have their good qualities or not, the worst of men have. Men change. But one of the worst supertitions prevalent in the recent times is that in an association with Communists, it is the other party that loses and they do not change. Communists are also likely to change, both their leadership and their rank and file. Such a change can, of course, only occur if there is an alternative more attractive than what the Communist parties of all views are presenting. In case Communist leadership does not change its ways, in spite of this more attractive alternative, the party will begin to break and its numbers will be reduced or its members will become inactive.

Unfortunately, however, a very sad state of mind has come to obtain among a large section of political leadership of all kinds in the country. If the Adivasis are truculent, kill them or suppress them. The hostile Nagas, kill them or suppress them If the Communists are violent or stupid or extra-territorial, kill them or suppress them. Whoever is naughty, kill or at least suppress. This is a very unhealthy state of mind. This probably derives from the Hindu caste system, which incidentally has come to prevail also among Muslims and Christians. What we need is skill and political craftsmanship, and above all, idealism, although I do not deny that a stage may sometimes be reached in internal or external politics when the use of force may become regrettably

necessary.

There is no attactive alternative to the Communists, at least not in Bengal. All political parties in that State base themselves on similar philosophical foundations. From time to time, they may quarrel over minor programmes. Most of the time, even this quarrel is not there. Difference of emphasis is more often than not a feature that distingushes Communist parties from other parties of Bengal. Of course, some international items like those of China, Tibet, Russia or Hungary cause a little excitement now and then, and some loss of temper. For the rest, the foundation is almost identical, whether Congress, Communist, Socialist, Forward Bloc or any other. This applies also to practically the educated classes in that State, certainly those educated men and women who are vocal and who influence opinion.

How do parties like the S.S.P., Forward Bloc, and the P.S.P. distnguish themselves from the Communists ? They may be a little more emphatic on Berubari than the Communists, but that also is somewhat doubtful, for when this question arose, there were no pro-China communists who had to be somewhat reticent about the Chinese ally. They may infrequently raise questions about Netaji Subhas Chandra Bose, whether he is dead or alive, and whether his statue, picture or name should be found at this or that place. Communists also follow a 'me-too' policy in such campaigns. They have forgotten those days when they called Netaiji a fascist, and have also eminently succeeded in making the people forget them. Communism and anti-Communism are almost entirely agreed on the question of language, for they both shout against 'Hindi imperialism'. Whatever their theoretical formulations on paper and occasional utterances during ceremonies may be, these parties all behave so that English continues. Therewith hangs another story.

One of the major staples of propaganda is the neglect of Bengal by the Centre, that is, the Delhi Government. This refreain is common to all political parties, not even excluding the Congress party, although it had naturally to go slow while it was in office in the State and probably also now because it governs the Centre. Very few people know that the industrial input in just one city of Bengal during all the Five Year Plans has exceeded that of all Hindi State put together. I should make it clear that I am talking

alone of industrial input, and not all inputs. Another sore point is that of food. They shout in unison about how the Centre neglects the State in the matter of adequate supplies of food.

Sometimes differences may be noticed in that hunger marches or all protest marches against increasing price are held either separately by each party or even different types of combinations. Slogans are pretty much alike, though, of course, the Congress party has not so far been mixed up in such campaigns. But I will not be astonished if there has been a demonstration or two of like nature during the past four months that the non-Congress Ministry has been in office.

A recent instance will floodlight the Bengal secene. The Education Minister, Dr. Triguna Sen, who is himself not very clear on these issues, is reported to have conferred with the Vice-Chancellors of Bengal Universities. These Vice-Chancellors came to the conclusion that Bengali was not a fit enough medium for higher instruction, and, therefore, the English medium must continue. I do not wish to waste my time over the stupidity of these Vice-Chancellors. If Bengali is not a fit enough medium, it can be made fit only through immediate and continual exercise, through use in courts, secretariats, universities and the like, and not through a compilation of dictionaries or books, whether text or any other. What irks me most is the fact that political parties and almost all their leading lights quote the opinion of these stupid scholars. In any country, there would be a large number of eminent men, although no guarntee is there that eminence will be associated with wisdom or learning. By now, there must be around fifty Vice-Chancellors and certainly thousands of college principals. These are all eminent men, some eminent in a smaller area and some over the length and breadth of the land, but their eminence may on examination be found to be mearley a matter of the office that they occupy. In all walks of life there is such eminence dissociated from principles, wisdom or learning, and yet, more in Bengal than anywhere else, I have found the ordinary man being impressed with such eminence, even the titles of Knighthood that were once conferred by a foreign government on such serviceable slaves, except for one or two titles which were indue time returned to the giver.

Political Bengal is not anti-Hindi alone. It is anti-Bangali too. I am not talking of the mass of the people. But the poor fellows

have not yet found their voice. Not a single party expresses their felt but mute needs. In a Bengal socialist camp which I recently visited. I made it patent that they were free to agitate as harshly as they could against Hindi, provided they agitated harshly enough against English. I got a revealing answer. There was at least one honest man there. He told me that if English went and Bengali came, could Hindi be far behind ?

How surprising it is that no political party in Bengal has taken up the cause of East Pakistan or the wider cause of Indo-Pak re-union ! I may be controverted with the example of some S.S.P. units in Bara Bazar and Central Calcutta. That brings me to a slight interruption in my main argument. All political parties in the State share a like mind in respect of the Bara Bazar and the non-Bengali speaking people. Not everybody in Bara Bazar is rich. In fact, the incidence of poverty in this area would be higher perhaps than anywhere else in Calcutta. But Bara Bazar is to the Bengal communist or forward blocer what Cavier and Champaigne were to the Eurpean Communists some years ago. All parties seem to be agreed that a Hindi-speaking leader in his own right shall not arise on Bengal soil. I might, of course, and that Hindi speaking sub-leaders in all parties are a cringing lot, easily given to small graft, poor and therefore victims of all the ills of poverty which is immigrant.

Communism thrives on Vietnam today and Cuba yesterday, Anti-Communism thrives on Tibet or Hungary. Occasionally, both of them may want to thrive on persecution of minorities in East Pakistan. Would parties native to the soil behave in this atrocious manner ? West Bengal and East Bengal are neighbours, not neighbours like France and Italy, but neighbours like Syria and Lebanon, or better still, England and Wales. Over a hundred persons have in recent months been killed by the Police in East Bengal. Several thousand are in prsion, Sheikh Mujibur-Rehman, their leader, is suffering. I do not know what indignities in imprisonment. But there has been no campaign against this East Pakistani repression in West Bengal. An argument which I am often given is that such campaigns would lead to further bestiality on the part of West Pakistan rulers, specially against the Hindus but also against the East Pakistani Muslims, such talking points can always be made in respect of every campaign. I am these days reminded of the argument that one cannot make the omlette

without breaking the eggs, though not necessarily, of course, in the way of violence that Lenin meant it. In any event, there is no forward looking Policy. I can understand up to a point that the Congress party does not possess it, because it is afraid overmuch of complications. Even a government party is, to some extent, different or at least ought to be, from its government, sometimes a difference of emphasis or selection or on the sly, not necessarily a difference amounting to encounter. What is most surprising is that no non-Congress party in Bengal is forward looking in the matter of the Indo-Pak re-union. Communist Party (Right) naturally cannot be. Their Tashkenti Seth would frown upon it. Communist party (Left) would not think of it, because Chinese thinking for the present runs along totally different lines. Such parties as take their inspiration from the other Tashkenti Seth, namely, the U.S., would also disfavour such a campaign. America as much as Russia dislikes instabiltiy. Any campaign that seeks to restore a new equilibrium in place of the present one is therefore disliked by both the Tashkenti Seths.

Why the S.S.P. does not take up such a campaign must be properly investigated. I do not believe that this is a party of cosmopolitanism, and anti-nationalism, or that it lives on borrowed thinking and experience. The only explanation for its in activity on this score is fear. It is afraid that its campaign may be so isolated and small as to cause no impact at all, perhaps ridicule It may also be afraid that its campaign might frighten the Muslims of West Bengal about the countinuance of Pakistan. without enthusing them over the re-union. Such fears never made any great movement. They are incapable of providing and alternative to the Communists who are for a veriety of reasons entrenched in the State politics. Even on the score of property and ownership, no party has thrown a radical challenge to the Communists. If Communists talk of bank nationalisation, all the other anti-Communist parties, barring, of course, the Swatantra and the Jan Sangha, which do not exist in the State, join in the chorus. State trading in foodgrains is another such chorus. But no party has ever come forward with a programme of limiting expenditure, amenities, profits and expense accounts. The All-India S.S.P. has such a programme. But the Bergal S.S.P. has not cared to propagate it or put up a fight tor it. This

programme of drastic cut on expenditure and on amenities is probably the most radical economic measure that has ever been conceived anywhere in the world. And yet the parrots of nationalisation do not wish to understand it. What is the reason ?

There is yet another feature of Communism in India which makes it more pernicious than elsewhere. It is coastal. It is not even spread over all the coast. It is primarily Bengali and Malayali It could also have been Telugu and it still might be but it is not so today. Half of India's coast lands do not accept it as a major doctrine. In the heart-lands or the mid-lands, it is a still more minor doctrine. This fact accentuates the provincial cosmopolitan and non-national character of Communism.

Bengal always been the meeting place of two contrary currents, the nationalist and universalist versus the cosmopolitan and non-national current. Those currents were stronger here than anywhere else. That may have been due to the fact that Bengal and Madras were the first to suffer the challenge of British culture and domination and, Bengal being the more emotional of the two, was strong in both the responses that it made. The one response was that of national self-respect. The other response was acceptance of what existed and imitation of those who had conquered.

In recent years, the nationalists and universalist current has been drying up in Bengal. Among its exponents, have been such persons as Vidyasagar, Bankin Chandra Chatterji, Viveka Nanda, Rabindra Nath Tagore, Nazml Islam and Subhash Chandra Bose. Netaji Bose was probably its last notable exponent. I shall not mention the older names of the example current, for that would unnecessarily create bad feeling. Suffice it to say that with the probable exception of Prof. Satyen Bose, there is not one notable man alive in any sphere of Bengal's public life who does not belong to the cosmopolitan non-nationalist current.

A cosmopolite is side looking. A revivalist is backward looking. A universalist is forward looking. Like a lion or an army, a universalist does not exclusively look-forward. He is frequenently glancing backward and side-ways. Insofar as he glances backwards, he does not become rootless nor lose his moorings and is a nationalist. Insofar as he looks sideways, he takes account of all that is happening in the world around him. A universalist is therefore in part a nationalist as well as a

cosmopolite.

Cosmopolites, however, are rootless and to that extent also topless and also incapable of any side-ways expansion. Their vision is so limited that they can only look sideways. Some of these cosmopolities look at Russia, some at America, some at China, some probably at France or whichever is the land of their choice and become so full of their false love that they have no creative strength left.

A cosmopolite is also a provincial in both senses of the term. He is a provincial insofar as he has established a direct link between his own little State and the world without the mediation of the nation and its national centre. Bengali intellectuals, writers, teachers, advocates are fond of establishing a direct link between Bengal and the world and, if politicians are unable to do so, it is not for any lack of will on their part but because the rest of the world does not care for them unless they are willing to become somebody's tools. Someone might hear the advanced argument that the national centre or the national language is far too poor and inadequate. So much the more reason, why the educated Bengali should try to build up this national centre and language. If the Bengali was a universalist he would not merely stop at bemoaning the poverty of Hindi but set about trying to remove this poverty. Only through the mediation of a national centre and a national culture and a national language could the cosmopolite stop being provincial.

The cosmopolite succeeds in establishing such poor links as he does, not with the whole world, but with a very small part of it, that is what makes the cosmopolite still more provincial. His link is sometimes with Washington. Yet another may have his links with Moscow. Some are trying to form links however ethernal with Peking. Small coteries of other provincials also exist. Let no one imagine that London has ceased to count. It is probably at the top, was not there a Bengali writer who sighed so soulfully at the spires of Cambridge that a British fun-maker took note of it. The cosmopolite is imitative and I am sorry to have to say that all leading writers of all political parties in Bengal have become cosmopolites.

Now makes mention of a safe and an unsafe left in connection with colliery happenings. The safe left is the SSP. The unsafe left is the Left Communists. It is difficult to see how

the imitative non-national cosmopolitan uncreative left Communist is unsafe to the existing order. Just because they kill or because they talk more often than not meaninglessly of nationalisation or Bara Bazar, they do not become unsafe to the capitalists, whether Bengali or Marwari. People have often remarked upon one particular feature of the gheraos which the Left Communists have practised. These gheraos have not inconvenienced the big capitalists, whether Marwasi or Bengali, they have inconvenienced alone the middle capitalist, the fellow below a capital of 5 million. It would probably be said that it is safer to start with the middle group rather than the top group. That would however make it safe leftism. In any event even if the Communists do not understand the distributive approach and are getting bogged at the mere nationalising of bank or road transport, non-Communist parties should now strive to understand this approach.

India is not like the industrial countrles of Europe and America. If there are let us say 5 million upper-class in this country, a good 3 million would belong to government servants and 2 million to what may be called the bourgeoise proper. This is a thing which is continusuly lost sight of in all types of analysis. The bureaucracy may not own any capital to any great degree. But the expenditure of its top levels is enormous. Ours is a civilisation of amenities and allowances per excellence. One may easily get at the total cost of a top bureacrat to his state at more than 5 times his salary, more likely 8 or 10 times. Limiting of expenditurc would limit both the government man and the businessman. A left journal like "Now" would perhaps like to limit alone the businessman that makes safe left to the bureaucracy and the top of the free professions. The party this journal call the safe left would however seek to limit the expenditure of both types of people. That does not exclude the possibility of bank nalionalisation. In fact such a limiting of expenditure might necessitate not ouly bank nationalisation but nationalisation of several other types of industries and factories, but it goes beyond that. It is this beyond that I would like to emphasise. Unfortunately, however, no political party in Bengal, not even my own has been willing to emphasise this distributive, aspect of socialism or communism.

Some fun has been pocked at the SSP's insistence on a Harijan Minister in the non-Congress cabinet. To Part of the fun of the

criticism I would also like to subscribe. The SSP would have given a cleaner account of it-self if It had in the initial instance selected a Harijan out of its ministereial quota. But politics, "Now" should know, are a curious mixture of self-interest and idealism. This is what gives politics the passion that belongs to it alone. If in the pursuit of some self-interest some ideal is served, on in the pursuit of an ideal some self-interest is gained, that is only part of game. Very few men there are at any time in any country whose idealism preponderates so heavily as to kill or maim their self-interest.

Bengal's educated classes have rarely shown an understanding of the caste problem. Of the nearly thirty million inhabitants of West Bengal, roughly five million are high-caste anywhere between seven and ten million are Harijans or scheduled caste and roughly half the population comprises of backward castes. Political leaders in their own right of whichever party are drawn from the higher castes. Birendra sasmal, of mahisya ancestry, was probably the last backward caste leader in his own right and his rise may have been due to the Gandhian ferment. The cosmopolite, of which Bangal's communists are an excellent model, does not understand all this. To him caste is no problem at all, for it does not exist in Russia or America. He therefore believes, if he is a radical, that the class struggle would resolve all conflicts and emancipate society. But the problem is not that simple. Even if the class struggle is practised sharply, frequently and successfully, the likelihood is that its leadership will go to the more courageous or clever among the higher castes. Backward castes will stay backward in comparison. Only when a leadership is deliberately nurred among them, they will look at it and see in it their possible future and rise with its help. Bengal's communists and other cosmopolitans don't quite realise how effectively they have suppressed their backward castes and that to that extent they are the most caste-ridden state. Someday, a nationalist universal leadership will arise that will make Bangal's and India's history move on the two equally important wheels of class and caste struggles.

As long as a party of nationalist universalism is not built in Bengal, Communism will continue to have its field day. Delhi may shout about it. Newspapermen may shout about it. Anti-Communist political parties may shout it. But nothing will come out of it. Only the kind of a philosophy that I have outlined and

the programme emanating from it are likely to defeat Communism. Then, Naxalbari, Asansol and calcutta may not happen or even if they do, there will be an easier solution to them. Otherwise there will always be a Naxalbari and always a Calcutta or a Asansol.

Everybody talks of land hunger these days. That is a fashion. People do not seem to realise that with passage of the time this fashion will tend to grow. At the moment, the acreation nurtured per head of the population is about 6. In another 10 years it will fall to 5 and then perhaps to 4. If all those engaged in forestry or mining or tea plantation were to be regarded as claimants of land, and also the number of the agricultural population proper that are yet to come, the hunger for land would be like the thirst of Sahara. I quite conceed the problem of the agricultural labourer and the share croppers that must be handled satisfactorily.

Aside from opening out of virgin lands through a food army comprising mainly of share croppers and agricultural labourers, abolition of land revenue, fixation in practice of a minimum agriculture wage, firm ceiling on land holdings, and above all, regulation of prices of all commodities, industrial and agricultural, there is only one radical solution to the land problem. Fix a minimum of agricultural produce per acre. Fix also a minimum of water, seeds, fertilizers and other essential needs per acre. When the State makes available to the land holders this minimum of requirements and yet production falts below the expected minimum, such land should be taken away from its present holder. Let conservatives call it a confiscation measure. I wonder what the journ "Now" would call .it, safe or unsafe left. But this is the only way to change the Indians love of land from its present irrationality to a more understanding one. To-day, the Indian loves land in its length and breadth. Let him love it in its depth.

29

PLEA FOR A BUDGET WITHOUT FOREIGN AID

RAMMANOHAR LOHIA

It was claimed in some quarters that we were going to have a very good budget this time, a budget that would bring new life to the country, and open up a new era of progress and self-respect. But when the budget was placed before us, it was found that there was not a drop of life-blood in it. It did contain something, but they were bottles of liquor. Liquor bottles (for the states) but not a drop of life-blood.

I may here digress for a moment to point out that prohibition and gold control were good programmes in the initial stages. But they failed because elements surrounding the country's rules during the last twenty years used these laws as a source of profit, and the people also did not have the necessary will to implement them. Volunteers to carry forward these programmes were simply not there.

I have on many occasions received the offer that thirty members from the treasury banches are willing to cross the floor, providvd the opposition remains united and combines to form a government. At the moment, it is difficult to guarantee this. The Prime-minister also who usually looks harried these days, becames happiness when she finds opposition groups fighting each other. This happened during the debate on West Asia recently Listening to Shri Atal Behari Vajpayee during the debate, I felt that Shri Vajpayee and Shri Dange and Shri Gopalan can easily work

together in government. There may be some difficulty with the extremists—like Shri Balraj Modhok and Shri Shrikanthan Nair. It may take some time before they came together, but what Shri Vajpayee and Shri Dange said, and also Shri Gopalan through Shri Rammurthi, said, basically amounted to the same thing. In fact, the Prime-minister also took the same stand. A lot of hot air was generated by her and also by others, but what did it all come to ? Not a single soldier no supplies, not even a medical ambulance was sent. No one spoke about giving any practical help to any side. In terms of action everyone was neutral or non-aligned.

Whv shouldn't all the opposition groups come together on this basis in matters of foreign policy also ? I was a little surprised that USA and USSR agreed on much less than what Shri Parthasarathi had proposed in the Security Council. Our politicians ponder over this. While USA and USSR come together, their supporters continue to fight.

The single biggest trouble with us is foreign aid, or the foreign element that has entered our politics, our economy, our finances, our industry and agriculture. Let me refer briefly to how India lost both her body and her mind to others.

In October 1949, the then Prime-minister of India had gone to the USA. He had asked then for two million tons of wheat and for capital aid. But he had not begged for it. There was some pride and self-respect during those days. The Americans refused help. How long did the pride last ? From October 1949 to December 1950. Then the the ambassador there wrote to the Americans requesting and in the form of capital and two million tons of wheat. The law passed in USA about this aid clearly mentioned that they would provide wheat and other aid, but in turn would take from India "materials required by the United States as a result of the deficiencies, actual or potential in its own resources" and there would be arranged "immediate and continuing transfer of such materials, particularly those found to be of strategic and critical significance." This was done in 1951 and India began to supply manganese and monazite ore, essential in the production of nuclear energy. After 1951, USA acquired control over India's body.

At one stage, the draft law in the US Senate specifically

mentioned manganese and monazite, but when the two houses of the American Congress considered the draft jointly, these words were omitted so as to save India's face to some extent. Even now, eighty or seventy per cent of India's trade relations is with the Atlantic bloc. Under article 7 of the same law arrangement were made for the training of students, teachers, technicians and the like.

We should also understand the Russian position correctly. Just as America needed a country like India after having lost China, Russia after Stalin also needed a country which would counter balance China. Kruschev and Mikoyan met Indian communist leaders for the first time in Peking in 1954. Things began to move after that mutual exchange began in June 1955 and after that Indo-Russian friendship began to develop. Both USA and USSR needed a power to be put against China.

America took India's body, and Russia our mind. When body and mind are separated, it is the body that becomes important. In fact, I should not say 'mind' for Russia was concerned only with speech, that we should be with them in speech. Russians had also to assure their own people that if 700 million Chinese were becoming hostile, the 500 million Indians were becoming friendly to them. Besides, they wanted the public sector in India to gain against the private sector.

Generally people think that the cold war began at around that time. But the cold war was really over by 1950. By 1949 Russia and America had what they wanted. The Americans won in Greece and Iran and Turkey, while Russians succeeded in Poland and other East European countries. The cold war after 1950 was more play-acting than reality. Russia and America came to tacit agreement to preserve the *status quo* in the rest of the world. They agreed to keep India dormant and weak. China unfortunately fell into the trap like a wild animal. It broke its teeth while trying them against Matsu and Quemoy. So in its madness it dug its teeth into the soft Himalayas. But there is no doubt that the Government of India all along, was the agent of subservience poverty and disintegration. The Congress party, which was the agent of freedom during British rule, became the agent of poverty and slavery by becoming a victim of Russio-American manipulations and of China's madness.

If we look at the figures of foreign aid we find some strange

facts. Foreign aid constituted 5.8 per cent of the First Plan, around 21 per cent of the Second Plan, and 25 per cent of the Third Plan. In the fourth plan draft proposals also, foreign aid accounts for about 25 per cent of the provisions. The proportion of foreign aid goes on increasing. And what happens to income? During the first plan, national income rose by about 18 per cent, or a little less than 4 per cent per annum. The target for the 2nd and 3rd plans was 5 per cent, but the actual increase was only about 2 or 2.5 per cent. These figures conclusively prove that while foreign aid increased, our income decreased. Now it is necessary that we stand on our own feet, stop this type of foreign aid, and increase our national income.

At the same time, our balance of payments position has been deteriorating. The adverse balance during the first plan was Rs. 300 Crores, but now it has reached the figures of Rs. 6,300 crores. The plans claim to aim at self-sufficienciency, but what we have is only self-deception. I would like to say to men like Mr. Masani that Americans do not like pianning in their own country, but like it elsewhere. There was the Marshall plan for Europe. There is also some sort of a plan in India. Without a plan, it becomes difficult for them to give loans or aid. For the India government also, it becomes difficult to justify things without a plan, How, otherwise, would they be able to tell the people what they are doing. These are the two reasons behind planning—it enables the government to get loans, and helps to explain things to the people. There is no aim like self-sufficiency. On the contrary, the plans have resulted in a fantastic increase in our debts. If we calculate all the debts we have incurred, including the Rs. 2,000 crore sterling balances that were squandered away, and also the increase in debt liabilities due to devaluation, they come to Rs. 8,000 crores. It was only Rs. 32 crores in 1950. From Rs 32 crores to Rs. 8,000 crores; our debts have increased about 200 time. If our income, our capital, and industry and agriculture had also increased alongside, we could have understood it. But this government seems to be like the father who puts the burden of debts on his children for his own current expenses, and is not ashamed of what he does.

Another aspect of the plans is the negation of ideology. Let us remember what the government has been saying from time to time. First they said there is no 'ism', we should only think of

building India. When that did not appear adequate another slogan was given, of a 'co-operative commonwealth.' I do not know what it means. Then that was replaced by a 'socialistic pattern of society.' And now they talk of socialism. In fact what they want is that there should be no ideology; for, those who provide foreign aid want that there should be no ideology in this country. Planning, they say, should only deal with material problems. I have talked to so many foreigners. They immediately say, what this country needs are tractors and fertilizers. Not only Americans but also Russians. The Russians say that this country needs Bokaro, it needs steel. They always talk of material things, and never of man, and man's philosophy, of property relations and the organisation of trade, industry and agriculture. Americans and Russians are alike in this matter, and why not ? Russians have forgotten their past. They know the Russia of today, contented and prosperous. They wish to impose on India their current experience. Both America and Russia want the creation here of a consumption-oriented and modernised class which would understand and project their policies. There is very little conflict between the two. And that arises on account of the separation of body and mind which I mentioned earliear. Both of them want stability.

The government plans have destroyed all independent economic thinking and initiative in this country. All that remains is the desire to get money from other countries, to balance income and expenditure somehow, build a factory or two anyhow, while the country lives in a state of continuing famine. The extent of our dependence is indicated by the fact that the first plan was included in the Colombo Plan. And the second plan was prepared with the assistance of the Massachusetts Institute of Technology and the Harvard University.

In this situation, Mr. Masani may be right to some extent in saying that Bokaro should be dropped. Mr. Dange also is right when he asks for abolition of privy purses. Only his argument was not complete. It is not merely a question of five crore rupees. There is also the question of privileges, and of familly, caste, and dynastic politics. This is an extremely important question. So long as we keep a class that enjoys certain privileges on account of birth, the country can't go forward. But to both these friends, I would say, why stop at that ? Let us go a little further and cut facilities enjoyed by ministers, and the profits and amenities of

millionnaires. Cut all other wasteful expenditure. I am surprised when I find the Lok Sabha debating over small cars. I am not against small cars. I am against all private cars. All automobile manufacturing capacity in the country should be put to the production of tractors, buses, taxies or irrigation implements for the next 15 or 20 years. Similarly construction of houses and building should be suspended for a decade or two. Some people in government too, are now beginning to realise that all children, whether of the big men or of the small men, should study together in the same type of schools. If you add up all these cuts, the savings would amount to several hundred crores

The finance minister says that the States may do whatever they like, but with their own resources. If I were in any State government, I would say, that the Finance Minister should also manage everything with his own resources. He shouldn't take any foreign aid, and he should not print more notes. So far as the notes are concerned, the States have as much right over them as the Centre. If the States begin to return the Centre's challenge and ask the Centre to manage things with its own resources,—I would like them to do so—then we would see how far the Centre can go. I think that a very good budget can be framed even in the present critical state of our resoures, provided we do not look at it only from the angle of income and expenditure. We can secure resources through harnessing labour, and through cut in expenditure. I have already mentioned some cuts. I am not at the moment very much concerned with what things have to be nationalised. If necessary, nationalise everything. I am not concerned with whether the ceiling on expenditure is imposed directly, or through income-tax or some other means. But the ceiling must be fixed and implemented. In the present conditions, I would say that no one should be allowed to spend more than Rs. 1,500 a month. The finance minister would then get about Rs. 1,200 or so including all amenities. If this ceiling is imposed on expenditure, I estimate that somewhere Rs. 1,000 crores to Rs. 1,500 crores would be saved. This may sound a little surprising, but that is how things are.

Among government servants, whose number has now reached over ten to twelve million, there are at least one lakh who are there merely to maintain the pomp of big men. In cutting

expenditure, the expenditure on these men should also go. It is true, that the present government does not have the strength to do it. Perhaps even non-Congress government can't do it. But only a government that is strong enough either to put these men to work in industry and agriculture, or to dismiss them, can solve India's problems.

I do not like increment in allowances and bonus etc. for it becomes a vicious circle. But who starts the circle? If the Centre increases the allowances of its own employees to maintain itself in power, why shouldn't the State government employees try to increase their own allowance in turn? The Congress government is interested only in keeping itself in power. Otherwise we should be concerned more with cutting the expenditure and facilities of those on the top, than with increasing the allowances of those lower down.

There is no integrity left at the top. For twenty years the loot has been going on. Every one takes what he can. Our economy is not expanding or developing. There is no faith left. The people do not believe that our industry and agriculture can develop or expand, and when this faith is destroyed, every group tries to increase its own share. Whether in the name of language, or region, or caste, everyone is busy increasing his own share, because he thinks the total cannot be increased.

A sum of Rs. 1,176 crore has been provided for the Central plan in the budget. It seems the Finance Minister has cut about Rs. 1,000 crore from the plan. I would suggest that this saving should be spent wholly on irrigation and on nothing else. By all means water should be made available. If I had the power, I would have had the budget so made—and resources for it are present—that the 300 to 400 crore rupees that we pay to others for food would be halved or quartered in a single year, and totally eliminated in the second year. Within five years, all cultivated land would get water for irrigation. But to achieve that, single-minded devotion is needed, and that single-mindedness is absent.

There is a lot of talk these days about ending monopoly. I feel sorry at the manner people get entrapped in these things. There has been more anti-trust movement in the USA than anywhere else. For twenty years the movement continued. But when laws were enacted against monopoly, it was found that concerns

were broken up, each company was divided into five or six; but the monopolists became richer than ever. It is a mistake to think that merely by passing a law or two you can tackle the rich and achieve your aim.

I am reminded of another event in the context of American aid. One Prof. Sidney Hillman came to see me some time back. He was incharge of Asian and South Asian affairs at the time of President Kennedy. When China had attacked India, he came here with some mission, probably with Mr. Averell Harriman. At that time they had told the then Prime Minister that India should have a settlement with Pakistan and only then would see be able to face China. The professor then mentioned Mr. Harriman as having said that Indians probably are now a little too old and tried, and are afraid of doing anything new. That is why the suggestion was not acted upon. I told the professor that Harriman was probably right, but he should not forget that America has plenty of money and plenty of bombs. Those with lots of money and bombs tend to develop an episodic mind. Consequently when the mission came, it asked the government of India to have a settlement about Kashmir. If America had thought of suggesting that a settlement should be made ending the partition of 1947, so that the issue of Kashmir could be settled as a part of it, it would have been very good. The professor suggested that I was probably right. He might have said that to please me, though it is also possible that he appreciated the point.

Shri P. L. Lahiri, in his book on East Pakistan describes how in the general elections of 1954, the Muslim league was finished in East Pakistan. It was probably a unique election in the history of the world in as much as the ruling party's strength was reduced from 310 to just 9. Everything changed. The very basis of Pakistan was eroded. Hindu-Muslim hostility came to an end, and people were afraid that East Pakistan would probably break way from West Pakistan. But then, unfortunately, the Deputy Speaker of the East Pakistan Assembly was killed That gave Mr. Ayub Khan his opportunity, who was then an army officer.

The book goes on to add that the Pentagon, i.e., the American Defence Department, had a hand in it. I feel that the C.I.A. might also have something to do with it. Both Russia and America are like the house-wife who while busy in household work, keeps her ears tuned to what the children may be doing At the

least unusual sound, she runs to find out what is wrong. The American Pentagon particularly runs at the slightest warning.

At that time, when some good things were happening in Pakistan, when anger was directed as much against Muslim as against Hindu, when the sin of partition was probably going to be undone, the aid-giving Americans saw red.

The aid that American give is mostly of fancy goods, for American Security lies on one hand in the bomb and on the other in those people in Asia and Africa who spend more than Rs. 1,000 a month. This is equally true of the Russians. Both of them act in a manner that would keep the people of India in the morass of poverty. Forty nine crores of people would continue to be poor, but there would be some 50 lakh or one crore people, spending over Rs. 1000 per month, to provide security to them. In this respect there is no difference between Russia and America.

Foreign aid should now be wholly rejected. There is no gain in it. It has completely vitiated our minds. We can see that everyday in the conduct of opposition groups. Foreign aid has spoiled our minds.

30

EQUALITY AND PROSPERITY*

RAMMANOHAR LOHIA

If socialism is to be defined in two words then they are equality and prosperity. I do not know if this definition has been given earlier at any time. If so, I would call it the best definition given so far. The meaning of socialism is ingrained in these two words : concrete meaning in terms of time and place, and total meaning in terms of ideals.

Absolute equality is a dream. Those who do not dream at all, are opportunists. Those who only dream, turn into ineffective eccentrics, removed from reality. A mind realistic and idealistic would dream total equality and try to achieve maximum equality keeping in view the time and place.

Everybody wants prosperity for the people. There are a few spiritualists who think man should—progressively decrease their wants. There are some who preach this truth but do not hesitate to increase their own wants. They are cheats and it is useless to talk about them. Such people who try to decrease their wants or at least not to increase them, even when they have the means to do so, do not generally go about asking the people to decrease their wants. The standard of living of the ordinary people specially in India is so low that only the most insentive can talk of its being further lowered. Still, the desire to limit one's own wants is part of a full and happy life.

Equality and prosperity are twins. This truth is being clouded

*Translated from the original Hindi.

these days in our country. The supporters of free enterprise put great emphasis on private profit for any economic progress. These people say that inequality is bound to exisst with private profit. This is the result of looking at the problem from the emotional angle of an individual; however, the conclusion would be entirely different if looked at from the point of view of history and the whole society. There is greater inequality in a poor society. In an industrialized though capitalist society there is a greater degree of equality. It appears that to make the whole society prosperious it is necessary to have vigour in its constituents i.e., in its members. In a vigorous society the possibility, of inequality inspite of individual disparities, is not as much as in a society without vigour.

In a poor, unequal and caste-ridden country like India, even communism has become a cause of poverty and inequality. Congress men who are in power, or the men in opposition, or both together have made Marxism in India a sterile doctrine. There have been two aspects of Marxism : one is modernisation or industrialisation, that is, prosperity, and the other is limiting of private property and eradication of disparities in personal incomes and expenditure or at least reducing it to a minimum. Marxism in India wanted to achieve the first without the second and as a result lost its edge. All this was easy because our society is caste-ridden and the communist leaders are mostly from the upper castes.

In passing, I would like to mention a fact here. People all over the world, generally, have a curiousity and fondness towards the foreigner when there is no international conflict. This in India has become so undignified and vulgar that the big men consider themselves closer to foreigners than to their own countrymen. There could not be anything more conceited and mean than the manner in which the upper classes in India have lived for centuries. The most marked symptom of this meanness is, that their pattern of living, customs, language, habits, dress, literature and consequently their minds are oriented to some country or the other. Where the number of poormen and beggars is small, it is easier to share the comforts of life. But where their number is large, the aristocrats or the rich create a world of their own. The richman thinks that, if there is greater contact between the two, his life would become miserable and unbearable. There does not exist in the world any iron curtain similar to that which exists in India,

between the upper class and the common man. That is why this upper class of India is the least graceful and powerful among all its counterparts in the world. The matter has come to such a pass that this graceless and powerless upper class is faced with the dilemma of either to continue its old habits or to make the country prosperous.

The world all over is becoming prosperous. Centuries of dirt and filth have accumulated in India. There is only one way left to make this country prosperous and that is the way of equality. Here equality is the means and prosperity the end. Even a thoughtful capitalist, would not find alternative to it. Whether the system is capitalist or socialist, industrialisation is not possible without capital. In a poor and diseased country like India, capital could be formed only through the way of equality. Capitalism cannot perform its own functions here. Capitalism cannot creat capital. Prosperity can come only through equality.

Now I would try to set down some possible manifestations of equality, keeping in view the time and place, There would be no attempt to prepare a comprehensive programme. Of course, I have spent two to three decades in thought and action, in respect of the inseparable relationship of total and possible equality. Each of the following ideas is the product of this relationship. (1) Primary education should be of uniform standard and type and the expenditure on schools and the salaries of the teacher should be uniform. All privileged schools for primary education should be closed down. (2) Uneconomic holdings should be exempted from taxes and land revenue. It is quite possible that as a result land taxes and land revenue might be replaced by agricultural income tax (3) A 5 or 7 year plan should be drawn upto provide irrigation water to all agricultural land. This water should be provided either free or at such minimum cost or credit that every peasant may use it for his land. (4) English, as a medium, should be removed from all sectors of public life, (5) No person should be allowed to spend more than one thousand rupees per month. (6) There should be one class for all passengers in the railways for the coming two decades. (7) For the coming twenty years, all the capacity of the automobile industry should be utilised for the manufacture of buses, tractors, or taxis and the manufacture of cars for private use must stop. (8) Price fluctuations of any one crop should not exceed more than 20 per

cent and the selling price of an essential industrial—commodity should not be more than one and a half times its cost. (9) 60 per cent preferential opportunity should be given to the backward communities, i.e , the adivasis, harijans, women and the backward castes among the Hindus and non-Hindus. Obviously, this principle of preferential opportunity does not apply to such vocations as require special skill e.g. surgery, but executive or legislative functions cannot be counted as such. (10) Ownership of more than two houses should be nationalised. (11) Effective distribution of land control over its price.

Every item of this 11-point programme is full of explosive possibilities. It may be less in some, more in others, but it is there in every item. Even if one of these items is worked upon, it would have tremendous consequences. The item of limiting of expeniture to one thousand rupees per month needs to be closely examined. In one sense, it would mean complete nationalisation of industries and trade. But this item goes even beyond that. With the fixation of ceiling on monthly expenditures of government services, officials and ministers, the administrative revolution would take place along with the economic revolution. The various personal allowances should also be included in this ceiling. Only those expenditures which are justifiably for public work need not be included in this. Even the extensive nationalisation of communism would have less effect than this single item, because both administrative and business controls are implied in it. The main thing is the end. Means are secondary. Still one should know about the means. This monthly ceiling could be achieved either through nationalisation or limiting expenditures, or temporary checks on profit, or by proper fiscal policies Of course, those who cross the limit should be severely dealt with by law.

Fixation of minimum and maximum limits has been time part of the socialist thought (for quite a long). Not less than a hundred, not more than a thousand has been one of the slogans. With the maturing of thought, one realises the difference between the various methods to achieve the minimum and the maximum. It is easier to impose the maximum but difficult to reach the minimum. As soon as a Socialist government is formed the maximum should be achieved. It may take 5 to 7 years to reach minimum. I have said this in the context of the stable price

levels. Through inflation, it could be easy to achieve a hundred rupees a month.

Only a government having the courage to achieve the 100 rupee limit could control the number of the white collar employees. There is no doubt that almost half or at least one third of the present ten to twelve million government employees are superfluous. But no ideology in this country could dare to straightway retrench this section. If socialist thinking could beeome strong enough, then it could remove these workers from white collar jobs and employ them in productive works. If these two programmes are implemented they would together fetch to the nation a capital of about fifteen thousand crores, My calculation is only a rough estimate. I have been asking the government for the last three years to get the correct figures. But no effort has so far been made to make an assessment. Fifteen thousand crores of capital is no small matter. With this, the fields could literally be turned green. All lands could get water. Equality and prosperity are thus closely inter-linked.

Some people might say that a monthly ceiling on profit, salaries and expenditures might lead to stagnation. And there would not be any glamour or progress in economic pursuits. This argument does not have much meaning. A categorical answer is that there may or may not be any glamour in it, but there is no other way for capital formation and economic development. Besides, it cannot be disputed that when the Prime Minister and the millionaire all would be subjected to this ceiling, then it would be easier for all to be contented with their lots. The craze for glamourous life, as it is today would go. Other kinds of public activities and unselfish pursuits will bring new zest in life.

It is true that the fixation of a monthly ceiling cannot be the job of a coalition government. This programme could be implemented only when the country has passed through a great revolutionary phase. Then a government is formed which is committed to its implementation, failing which, it would risk moral condemnation. Ordinarily such a government cannot be formed by ballots at least in an European society. But there does not seem to be any logical impediment. If there is a determined will and circumstances are favourable, then such a government could be established even through elections. But one should not

expect a multi-party governmet to implement such a programme.

Fixing a monthly ceiling, and providing for a uniform primary education are two aspects of the same sky. This is a more difficult and effective proposition than the nationalisation of banks. Children between 5 to 10 or 11 would realise through these programmes concrete meanings of nation, community, integration, equality and humanity. The diseased, caste and class ridden poor socity of India would receive a severe jolt. But the aristocratic class would do its best to prevent this. It would be argued, that if all the children start learning abuses and spitting, then who would run the country. It is easy to retort : When the children of the upper class would learn such manners, then primary education would be reformed soon enough. Any situation in which a programme stirs all the 480 million people of India would always be better than the present diseased state of the country. Then again, it would be argued that this programme would equate the intelligent pupil with the dullard. This is not correct because what is being levelled, is not the capacity of the intellect but the expenditures on education, books and salaries of the teachers. Finally, the women of the upper class would plead with the socialist and other—legislators of the new government and their wives, that their children and hence the country is being pushed back. In sudh csrcumstances, a major part of the legislators might get inclined to preserve the *status quo* in the name of caution and patience; it would be said that every step should be taken after great deliberation. This has only one remedy. Active members and committees of the various parties should be powerful enough to keep the legislators strong and if necessary to threaten them with strong action. This programme has not been implemented up-til-now in any country of the world, including Russia and China. In these countries, the higher classes live in exclusive areas. So the education of their children is also different from others. That is not possible in India, because the lower classes in every area, e.g., the barbers, the washermen kahars, etc. out-number the high class by four or five times. When the country becomes destitute, one can escape poverty only by staying within the palace. Still, one has to keep a strict eye on possible clever designs in this context.

Everything turns into a clash between the development of the individual and the development of the society. Without this clash

nothing good can be achieved either. The situation is so bad that even good self-interest cannot be promoted without serving the social interest. But the mind of the nation so is deteriorated that every one thinks it is possible and easy to add to one's own share but difficult to add to the collective total. Therefore, any programme must have the strength to effectively push aside selfishness and promote social interests. The greatest sin of the socialism that was in power in India during the last 18 years, or was near it, has been that it only paid lip-services to democracy, equality, secularism, nationalism, internationalism and revolution, but never tried to spin out concrete programme out of these principles and then to weave the programmes into the woof and warp of principles.

On the contrary, while this socialism has been hollow and meaningless it has called others, which attempted reciprocity between the abstracts principle and the concrete programmes, unprincipled.

Society has to be changed. When and in what circumstances, the 11-point programme or any of them could be implemented successfully, is difficult to say. I can only say that even if one item is successfully implemented it would initiate a revolutionery government and generate self-confidence in the people. It is true, that at a cartain stage it would become necessary to confiscate such properties as have been acquired through governmental privileges enjoyed after 1947. If all properties are confiscated, then there may not be any need to confiscate such properties separately; otherwise, this would be the first step in the building of national character. It should be indelibly etched on every Indian mind that revolution is not a shop to make profits.

Whenever and wherever a non-Congres government is formed, the first danger that it will face will be the joy and elation at the success. If I could have my way, I would turn the people and paritcularly members of the SSP against such premature elation. The time to wear garlands won't come when the Congress government is removed. When cetain definite policies have been implemented and their results achieved, then could come the time to wear garlands and to enjoy feasts.

One should not forget that the effects of Communist ministry in Kerala could not be the same as of a non-Congress ministry

in Bihar, U.P., Madhya Pradesh or Rajasthan. In terms of representation in the Lok Sabha, Bihar has three times as many members as Kerala and U.P. five times. The neighbouring states of Kerala are Mysore and Tamilnad. In matters of language and in other matters too, there is not much of give and take among them. What happens in Kerala, does not have much effect in other neighbouring states. But it is different with the Hindi speaking states. What happens in one state would have lightening effects in other states. After having once been seated in power it becomes a natural desire to stick to it. No right thinking man would give up power for inadequate or frivolous reasons. The first duty of any one who is in politics should be to get power and to retain it, but not in all circumstances. It is better to give up power, if it entails sacrifice of principles and self-respect.

In the past, I have made the mistake of advocating unreal idealism in certain situation. In situations where the party is not in absolute majority and the formation or removal of a government is possible only with the co-operation of other parties, I advised toleration of a government without participating in it. This policy suffers from two drawbacks. Greed has overtaken Indian politics and this background, it is not practical to keep any party outside the realm of achievable power. Attempts to do so result in weakness, splits and eccentricity. The result of adopting the policy of toleration without participation in a government is that on the one hand, there would be less of good work done, and participation in unpopularity would always be there.

We should firmly make up our minds that any ministry that the SSP would join must perform some necessary work within three months. Either the work is done or the ministry must resign. It is necessary to take such a firm resolution. For example, a resolution could be taken about land levy and land revenue. If in even one state a ministry is fromed in which the SSP is a participant, then it should be expected that this ministry would abolish land revenue within three months of its assumption of power. There would be many obstacles. Even a section of the party, might characterise it as useless. Possibly other parties also may not like it. Therefore, a debate on such questions should start from now.

It is also possible that the Congress government in the centre

might obstruct. Nothing could be better than that. Then there would be a clash between a progressive and forward looking state and a reactionary and backward looking centre. Then in a dramatic way, a revolutionary action will have been accomplished within months, which otherwise could take years, or decades.

31

THE CIVIL DISOBEDIENCE MOVEMENT, 1960
[Lohia's Letter to Party Members]

RAMMANOHAR LOHIA

THE AIMS

What can be the possible aims of the civil disobedience movement ? (1) To remove the present government, (2) to force the government to accept people's demands, (3) to mobilise maximum numbers and to secure their participation, (4) to bear witness to truth and to suffer irrespective of consequences. Considering the organisational strength of the Socialist Party and its reach, the first aim can at best be a desire but no solution and, except as a freak, there should be no calculation abovt it. Even with regard to the second aim, a propagandist strength of a much higher order than that attained by the Socialist Party, not to talk of the organisational strength, would be required to achieve it.

The demands of the civil disobedience are attainable, even by the present government, though they are deeply revolutionary. Price policy, language policy, caste policy and land revenue policy are the four demands, Price policy would occasion an economic revolution, language policy a political revolution and caste policy a social revolution. And they are also of such immediate need to the mass of the people that a popular outburst may not take place only because of the distrust, apathy and fragmentation of the people.

Actually, the second aim of acceptance of demands and the third aim of maximum mobilisation of people are not very distant from each other, for maximum mobilisation, when it has reached a certain point, leads to acceptance of the demands. The essential thing whether this maximum participation is enough to achieve victory or falls short of it should not be a matter of excessive concern, for to one who looks upon this present civil disobedience as one in a series of permanent civil disobedience interspersed with people's education, electioneering, constructive work and individual disobedience, maximum mobilisation of the people attainable at the moment should be enough satisfaction. It goes without saying that such an effort at maximum mobilisation is possible only at such points where the Socialist Party and its demands are well-known and where it has some organisation. Undoubtedly, some channelling of energies and direction of civil resisters into such points will have to be done.

At most points, however, civil disobedience will just be an act of suffering and no more but also no less. Nothing would be more foolish than to deride such civil disobedience or to treat it as mere ceremony. Even among some members of the Socialist Party, a curious habit of treating an organised civil disobedience as a necessary ceremony has grown. That is because they are yet unable to see that going to jail is like telling the truth, both of no immediate value, at least in India, but perhaps decisive in the long run. Even if men take to civil disobedience as an occasional ceremony of jail-going and truth-telling, they would build the base for a future mobilisation of the people. In areas, therefore, where civil disobedience will be no more than token, let the sufferer never forget to link up his suffering in mind to that of areas of people's mobilisation or to the future prospects of his own region.

THE FORMS

About satyagraha as token or suffering no further propaganda is necessary beyond publicising the forms of resistance and the fact that every individual, whether party member or not, is free to practise any of these anywhere at any time he likes, About satyagraha with people's mobilisation there would be need to select the points and to channel into them. Who would select

these points, how should they be selected, who would direct resisters from neighbouring areas towards them, are some questions that arise. There are questions relating to the agencies of our struggle, a subject which we must indeed be clear about, but which need not engross us overmuch. Too great a pre-occupation with the agencies of the struggle, particularly in the present state of organisation can be disastrous. The agencies may either be smashed up by police action in one stroke, resulting in a state of not knowing what to do, or they may forget the distinction between satyagraha and armed warfare which is that the generals of satyagraha must at least by turn place themselves in the forefront of the army and not keep to the rear, resulting in a state of unwillingness among the ranks to obey instructions. Therefore, the primary thing is to know the forms of struggle and to broadcast this knowledge widely and a secondary thing it to organise the agencies.

Picketing of courts other than judicial court as also of certain government offices is the form of resistance now become popular and well-known through frequent use. Without abandoning this form, it will be necessary to go beyond it and to practise other forms of resistance.

The possible forms of satyagraha are in fact implicit in the four people's demands. The demand for abolition of land revenue on profitless agriculture has its corresponding form of resistance in the picketing of tehsil offices, where land revenue is deposited. The demand for a price policy can assume rich variety of forms of resistance. It may be expressed through picketing at the offices that deal with or gather indirect taxes on essential commodities like excise office, sales tax office, offices of various cesses, offices of supply of commodities for which there is a quota and the like. It may take the form of picketing at big godowns, factory gates, and wholesalers, who deal with manufacture or store essential commodities including foodgrains. Such picketing need not be confined to selected satyagrahis, but may be made open to anybody and the masses who wish to join it, if they have the non-violent strength for it. Non-violent strength in this case would mean the ability to squat peacefully when challenged by the police or beaten up by it. Wherever there is overwhelming strength, and the police is not able to or does not dare to intervene, one form of satyagraha would be to take possession of a government or

wholesalers godown and to sell the commodity stored in it at what are reasonable rates according to the demanded price policy. For instance, the reasonable price of sugar comes to 12 annas a seer, and in case the government concedes a fair price to sugarcane growers, to 13 anaas a seer, while the price of wheat and rice would vary between 7 annas and 8 annas a seer according to the distance of the locality from the place of production. This form of resistance is most unlikely to be practised anywhere, for there is at present no where the non-violent strength for it, but it must be put on record as a possible form and who knows, there might be some rare locality, which may currently develop the strength for it.

Similarly the demand for a language policy may be expressed through a very rich variety of froms of resistance. It may take the form of blackening or scouring out the English portion of name-boards and the like of government offices. It may take the form of intervention in colleges, or courts, asking the lecturers or the magistrates not to use English as their medium of communication. It may take for form of picketing at offices or printing presses that publish daily news papers in English or at post offices that transmit telegrams in English. It may also take the form of intervention from galleries of legislature when members of these bodies talk English rather than their own languages and the interventionist may read out the names of habitual offenders among these legislators. There might be many other such forms of non-violent action.

To the four people's demands, every group, locality or party unit is free to add its own major demand and to evolve the form of struggle corresponding to. Government's policy of loans, particularly agricultural loans, whether for seeds or manure or tacavi or housing, is such that the people don't benefit by it or only very slightly. The demands for a change in these loan policies might be expressed through corresponding forms of picketing including mass picketing at offices and godowns for these loans. Another illustration of local action that might assume massive proportions is entry into Urvasiam. It would be worth while exploring the legislation concerning minimum wages as in the coal-fields or the problems of alcoholism in those places or indebtedness among the Adivasis like the Bhills or the proplem of a separate homeland and the Jharkhand could not be tackled through

appropriate demands and corresponding forms of struggle. Every locality should be free to experiment with its own demand and form of struggle, provided of course the national demands and forms of struggle are not entirely pushed into the background. Restrictions on liberty have become exceedingly manifold and irksome. Hundreds of rules, orders and decrees are in vogue, which are a flagrant violation of the Constitution. A special aspect of the 1960 civil disobedience should be the violation of all rules that restrict liberty without constitutional validity.

Some of these forms of action must be announced in advance, for they would need massive participation of the people. All forms of action need not however be so announced. It has become a current error to imagine that satyagraha must necessarily include advance announcement. The avoidance of secrecy only means that there should be no conspiracy nor desire for anonimity nor evading of responsibility. When the satyagrahi does his act publicly without wishing to run away from the consequence of his act, he need not in addition be expected to announce it in advance.

There should of course be no violence nor sabotage of any kind whatever. Nor an underground of any type. The whole purpose of the 1960 civil disobedience would be lost if any violence, sabotage or underground were tolerated.

A difficulty would arise in respect of localities with possibilities of massive people's mobilisation. There, the problem would be one of choice of the most appropriate form of struggle. Who should make this choice and undertake its direction ? Again, this is a problem of agency. There may or may not be executive or struggle committees of the Socialist Party or directors and the like. In addition, there should be no bar to the emergence of the spontaneous groups and committees that take upon themselves the choice and direction of this or that form of struggle In any ageney that goes beyond its positive task and begins negatively to discourage or condemn other forms of struggle is counterfeit and deserves no respect nor attention. Executive and agencies, if any, of the 1960 civil disobedience must only take up the function to "do this or that" and never transgress into the function of "don'ts"

Another serious difficulty would arise in respect of the composition of civil resistance in localities of people's mobilisation.

Most such civil resisters, both men and women, would be in rags or in soiled clothes. The police has got used to picking up those in Babu clothes and to taking them to prison, while it beats up the rest until they run away or arrests them and takes to distant places where it releases them. Something must be done about this blatant discrimination and the consequent danger to democracy and liberty. When this happens, there would be need to step on to more aggressive or more widespread forms of action. A bad custom has grown of trying to deflect such satyagrahis into distant places. Such a practice means an end of the massive aspect of the struggle, for the money to travel long distances is lacking unless of course the intention was to travel without ticket, a not very desirable type of action. Except up to distances of 50 miles which civil resisters would be able to cover by foot the locality must be provide its own more widespread and more radical forms of struggle.

A serious failing of earlier civil disobedience movements has been the suspension of *prabhat pheries*, processions and public meetings. These are entirely constitutional activity and while a disobenience may be on, the need for them does not diminish but increases. It may of course be not always easy to combine the constitutional activity of processions and public meetings with the unconstitutional activity of civil disobedience but whenever there is any possibility it must be worked out to the full.

THE TIME TABLE

The Socialist Party may reasonably be expected to wait until the beginning of March or April 1960 for government's acceptance or otherwise of the people's demands. But it may not be desirable to start satyagraha at once after the expiry of this time limit, even if the government reacts negatively.

It would be worthwhile if the party took a vote of the people on whether or not to undertake civil disobedience for the people's demands. Obviously, this vote could be taken only in places where the party exists and can collect votes either by announcing a voting place or additionally by going from house to house. Everybody who wishes should be allowed to vote and all that need be done is to record his or her name and to let the person vote

either publicly or secretly through a slip of paper that has a "Yes" and "No". This voting could be distributed over a week or even a smaller period and the exact dates may be either left to the appropriate committee, should one exist, or may be introduced into the resolution of the conference.

The months of January, February and March may meanwhile be used for propagating the people's demands and for holding *prabhat pheries*, demonstrations on the village, taluk and district levels. Efforts should be made to hold these demonstrations also on the village level.

After the plebiscite has been taken in the month of April, a fresh effort should be made with the government for the acceptance of the people's demands. This effort may be accompanied by peoples demonstrations on the level of the state. It might not be a bad idea if these demonstrations at state headquarters were all held on a single day, say for instance, the first or tenth of May, but they could also be distributed over the entire month of May. A demonstration in Delhi particularly of the city and environs may also be considered.

There should be no need on the present occasion to enrol satyagrahis. One may reasonably expect that the entire party would put itself into the satyagraha campaign and also that large masses of people besides at least in some areas will also take part in it. Should some committees or individuals, however, have already started on this work of enrolment or feel like doing it there would be no particular harm nor gain in it.

The satyagraha may according to this time table, start on the 1st of July. The start of the satyagraha may be hearlded with a general strike and processions and meetings. One does not know how far the strike in the sense of bazar hartal would succeed nor if any trade unions would be interested in organising a factory strike. But the fact that such an effort may not be very successful should not prove a deterrent. After the start of the satyagraha, the various forms already indicated could be put into operation either under the control of committees or spontaneously. Regions should be allowed to start the struggle in their areas.

Between now and the first of July, the other work of the Socialist Party such an enrolment of members, formation of constituency committees, organisation of thought sessions and sale of socialist literature, constructive work, naming of parliamentary

candidates, in addition to the popularising and demonstrating for people's demands, must be done with more than orninary vigour. A bane of the Socialist Party has been the unwillingness of its members to carry out more than one item of work at any time. Apart of course from the curse of not doing anything at all, all these bad habits must be eliminated.

AGENCIES

The normal agencies such as the committees of the party or various levels would be there. These could be reinforced by special committee appointed for the purposes of struggle in any one area, on condition that no director could hold office for more than one week.

Should the Socialist Party decide to suspend all committees and organisations on levels other than constituency level, it should not be difficult to build this time table into the resolution of the conference so that it could operate without any further direction or control.

This note has not talked of the great purposes of man, whether on the world scale or on that of the nation or the village. One of the demands namely the securing of 60 per cent of leadership posts to the suppressed groups and castes, which means the provision of preferential opportunities and priorities for groups disabled by tradition or social, political and economic arrangements in a manner unthinkable outside India has explosive possibilities for the world as a whole and of course for this country. By it alone do we erase the guilt of over 1500 years of Indian history and renew our country and our people. What emotions this and the demand for price policy may rouse among disabled groups of the whole world would depend upon the extent of our civil disobedience. The renewal of the people is also directly connected with a fifth peoples' demand that the frontiers of India should be kept inviolate. If any other world perspective have not been introduced into the people's demands, that should not be understood to mean that civil disobedience of 1960 does not aim at or would not indirectly achieve world objectives. There has naturally to be got the humility of reticence about them. For the propagandist and organisational strength of the party is yet limited. But two of these world perspectives must be mentioned. Through the theory

and practice of permanent satyagraha the Socialist Party is trying to introduce in man a new habit of resistance to tryanny and exploitation also when he is also alone and weak and unarmed. The Socialist Party would also desire the combination of all humanity into a world parliament and a world government, of however minimum powers and—hopes for the day when beginnings for a worldwide civil disobedience for this specific purpose could be made.

32

SOME SELECTED QUESTIONS AND ANSWERS*

RAMMANOHAR LOHIA

Question 1 : Why was Shri Koirala (B.P. of Nepal) separated from you ?

Answer : Ordinarily I do not get hurt in politics, but when I do get hurt its results are deep and last long. I believe that I was not that hurt, but still when a man whom I had trusted so much, with whom I had co-operated so much, played false with me, natually it was bound to affect me. My relations with him were such as if we belonged to the same country, as if we were comrades of the same party. Legally speaking Nepal is a foreign country, but emotionally Nepal is not outside. Nepal and India belong to each other, more so when they were together, had struggled together and had worked together. I am speaking this not only apropos of Koirala but of all Nepalis. Culturally, we belong to each other. As for Koirala in any case, there had been unshakable bond between us. We were together for four or five years.

But I was hurt by a few things. When the struggle was on in Nepal, I had told Koirala in Calcutta that we must undertake redistribution of land without delay, in those parts which were already liberated. This took place sometime in 1950-51. I had by that time come to realise that acts as redistribution of land cannot

*It is a Selection from the Questions and Answers which followed a lecture delivered to a group of Socialist trainees.

take place through mere legistation. It takes place effectively when there is a real change of government. Once you give time to the Parliament or State legislatures for five or ten years, then the revolutionary opportunities also recede. Such measures as land distribution or socialisation of factories etc. succeed when a revolution is on when a revolutionary government undertakes them immediately after seizing power. But once you let five or ten years pass by, people's mind become rigid and it becomes wellnigh impossible to give effect to any radical changes. All these can be achieved when a government is overthrown or about to be overthrown. I had told Koirala that the government was about to be overthrown, that it was so at least in one place, i.e., in the region of Viratnagar, where an independent government had been formed so he should immediately carry out measures for land redistribution. Secondly, I had told him that he should start working for general elections, that an announcement should be made to the effect that voters' lists etc. were being prepared for holding a general election. Thirdly, I had told him not to appoint his brothers or cousins to high offices in Viratnagar, or when the government was changed in the capital.

However, most of the big posts were given to his cousins and the replies that I got from him soured me greatly. What could he do, if there were no efficient or talented persons ? It is as if you get everything only within your clan, whether it is India or Nepal. My contention is that even if ability runs within a family, one must get outsiders for appointments, no matter if they do not have the necessary or have less talents. That was my reply to him, but my mind had already been soured on this issue of relatives. Secondly, when I saw that there was no land redistribution. I knew that the programme had been lost for ever. Things were bungled as in India. Now it has become clear that I had taken the correct attitude. Some might have felt that I was too bitter. Here was a man who was with me for four or five years like a younger brother, who used to respect me, who did not place anybody higher than me in this world, and I too respected him since I felt that only through him something could be brought about in Nepal. When such a man betrary your hopes, naturally one becomes bitter. May be, someone else in my place would have become less bitter, thinking that such are the ways of the world, you have to carry on somehow. I am not made that way. He had come once

or twice, and his eyes had become misty. But I had realised I could not do anymore. It has become a rule that who-ever wanted to achieve power, would come to me, but once power is achieved, he would start looking upto the man in power in Delhi.

One does not know if Koirala ever thinks of these things now that he is in jail. People look at things from their own point of view. He must be thinking that he had come to me later even after he had become a minister, had looked at me fully in the eyes, but I had not talked to him. He must have felt that he had been insulted. Really speaking, I had never insulted him. The fact of the case was entirely different. It was a question of principles, of building a new society. I do not know, if he and others would realise one day that opportunism, reformism, and favouritsm never succeeded in building up a new society. I had plainly told Koirala not to imitate the Indian Prime Minister. India is a big country of 44 crore people and its Prime Minister somehow managed to get along, he could indulge in these silly theories of talent in the family, or delays and habits of luxury but the situation in Nepal was different, for the future and for the people of the world this experiment will prove to be of immense benefit. Already, people in other countries are turning towards the path of non-violence. By itself, it is a great thing. I believe that an experiment was made in India. Had it been fully carried out, then the Independence we achieved would have been complete and there would have been no partition. However all these happened. At the back of these, there was this attempt to take India and the rest of the world to the path of non-violence and civil disobedience. In the process India's present was marred and freedom distorted. If this be the correct appraisal, it is also a terrific thing.

Question 2 : Did Gandhiji want to see India free in his life time like all other leaders ? What were your and Nehru's roles ?

Answer : Gandhiji had, after all, become a bit subdued. It is true that Gandhiji had opposed Partition. At the end he too was subdued, whatever the reasons. Either he had become old, or he was not prepared to fight against Nehru-Patel or he might have become too much frightened at Hindu-muslim riots or at his old age, he wanted to see India become independent. All these should be considered together. This much can be said about Gandhiji, but not about Nehru or Patel, that he was all the time hinting at disastrous consequence of the steps that were being taken. He was

feeling bad about it all. He had tried to avert it. He had put forward several alternatives to the partition resolution, but he did not fight till the bitter end. I think it was a weakness on his part. If Gandhiji had stood firm till the end, then it would have been different. May be, we would not have been freed in 1947 and remained a colony for ten, five or fifteen more years. There would have been perhaps, further killings, Hindu-Muslim riots. I admit all these. After all, after the partition of India, six or seven lakhs of people had been butchered, and about one and a half crore uprooted, left homeless, could there have been greater violence ? Had we not made the settlement with the British, we would have gone on fighting, and during that period, a thousand, two thousand or even five or ten thousand people would have been killed. The figure could not have gone up to six or seven lakhs and even if it had gone, what of that ? Either one resolves to die with courage or one dies on the sly from a stab at the back or like fly as at the time of the Bengal famine. You would accuse me of hind sight : I am saying this thing now, now that six or seven lakhs are already dead. Now you know the figures. Did anybody know at that time ? I assume that Nehru and Patel did not realise this. It is not necessary that one should take these men to be so low; it is no use to think them to be so low in this context. It would be wrong to say that knowingly they did all these. It is more likely that they were not aware. I myself was unaware. Comparatively, I was much younger and to that extent may be pardoned. Moreover, I was not in possession of the administration and all the police reports. These people were receiving these reports as they had already become ministers. Morsley has written about it in his book. Having the reports and being their age, they cannot plead innocence that they did not know what was going to happen. A leader who was also a minister and could not foresee what the partition would result in, must be a pretty bad leader. The point is, to what extent Gandhiji was aware of these. He too was not aware, but instinctively his mind was perturbed. He felt something terribly evil was taking place.

Question 3 : Who built the Party and who were its founding fathers ?

Answers : All people who attended the Foundation Conference in 1955 founded the Party. There is no point in naming any particular person. On the question of police firing there was sharp

disagreement at the Nagpur convention (1955). At the same time, there was the question of co-operating with the Congress. Then came explusions from the Party. I too, was expelled. After that, we all got together and founded the Socialist Party. The question of tracing the founding fathers is a tickish one for Socialists all the world over. Take the Socialist Parties of England, France or Germany, they do not know who their founding fathers were, the way we think about it in India. Or take the socialist Party of Japan, to bring in a coloured country. or the Communist Party of Yugoslavia, whom I consider better than the Communist Party of Soviet Russia. Till 1955-56 we, the socialist of India, took the Europe and Asia as our brothers, upto a point, the communists of Yugoslavia, if not exactly brothers, at least cousins. The most important binding factor was the world 'Socialist'. It is somewhat natural that you embrace anybody who happens to be a 'socialist'. But one should be aware of this world 'Socialist'.. France has proved what it means to be a French Socialist. And we have experience of the British Socialists. Here in India, people think Atlee gave India freedom and he was a socialist. But what a distorted freedom it was that brought in its wake mass butchery, riots and the partition of the country ! What did he do to Kenya ? These European socialists are rotten in the matter of imperialism and war. Within their own country they stand for the worker's welfare. Their agriculture and industry are improving. Their production is going up and brings all round benefit to the worker. His food, house, clothing standards going up continuously, whereas the conditions of the peasant, worker and the ordinary man in India and countries like India are either stagnant or deteriorating. This problem does not worry the socialists of those countries. Raise the standard of living—that is the slogan of the European socialist. Not all over the world, but within the confines of his own country. This is true not only of the socialist but also of the communist.

The communist of Russia talks of raising the standard of life like chanting the Gospel. In practice, it means that the standard of life should be raised within the frontiers of Russia. Both Russia and China are communist countries. Neither the Russian communist party nor the Russian workers are prepared to sacrifice for the sake of raising the standard of life in China. This ideal is not before them.

Today, the same lot is going on in trade in the communist world as in the capitalist countries. Agricultural products and raw materials fetch lower price than machines and industrial goods. The same happening within our country. Less price for the farmer, more for the industrialist, less for sugarcane more for sugar. This is what I call price loot. Those who have raw materials sell at a lower price and pay more for machines and machine made goods. This is the pattern not only amongst socialist as also communist countries. The communist in Russia does not hesitate to cut the throat of the worker of Communist China in this matter of price. Taking all these factors into account, I would ask you not to be misled by the world socialist. I do not thereby suggest that we should shun all friendly relations with the socialist parties of Europe. If our party becomes very strong in India, the socialist party of Britain and Germany would try to establish fraternal relations with us, even the Communist Party of Russia might try. We would say 'no' to none. But we must insist on complete equality in such relations.

Question 4 : When Party members become M.L.As or M.Ps why do they cease to take interest in the party ?

Answer : This is not wholly correct. It's true in some cases. Maybe, there is a change in the outlook when members become llegislators, either of the Assembly or of the Parliament. Upto a point, it is impossible to prevent this change, particularly in India, where the legislators are kept so separate from the people. As the army is kept in barracks, likewise the MLAs and MPs are kept in separate areas in their quarters, Moreover, their salaries are high. In England, they, i.e., the MPs get a salary of Rs. 1500 a month. They do not get railway passes nor quarters. Here when all things are added up, they come to Rs. 1500 per month, although the salary itself is Rs. 400. In England or in U.S.A. an agricultural labourer gets 15 to 20 rupees a day, never less than Rs. 15. In countries, where the agricultural labourer gets Rs. 15-20 a day, there the M.P. gets Rs. 50 a day. Thus the difference is between 20 and 50 or 15 and 30, i.e., three times or four times or four times. In our country, the agricultural labourer gets a rupee, but there are regions where he gets only eight annas a day—and an M.P. Rs. 50 a day. The difference is so great, that the man becomes a different man altogether. This possibility does not arise within our Party, but it has arisen in other parties.

The first thing that I would suggest : put an end to this 'barrack' system. It is true that the members of the Assemblies and Lok Sabha would be faced with some difficulties, but they should be prepared to share them with the people. If they started living in the midst of the people then they would realise their points of view. Secondly, for each legislator there should be an alternative legislator in the Party. The Party should see to it that such alternative candidates are groomed in every constituency. When some have become legislators, the alternative candidates, i.e., those who were not put up will naturally be hurt, they should be entitled to half the pay of the winning candidates. This will cure the disease and all this arrogance of the legislator will be done away with. I have thought somehow on these lines. But, please, drive this idea out of your mind that all MLAs and MPs are bad. There are people, who really live in great discomfort. There are too many people, one's own partymen who come for financial assistance, and our outlook towards them is none too good. When we have to do some work, say arrange a meeting and we need money to collect donations from the people, looks difficult and is a drudgery. One has to spend hours to get even a rupee. The short cut is to go to your MLA; after all he is the party's MLA; shout at him, he gets scared and one gets 10 or 20 rupees from him. This attitude is also bad.

There is a joke among the French people, but the whole world laughts at it. A Communist M.P. is closer to another non-communist M.P., instead of being closer to another communist who is not an M.P. This is true of the Congress, Jana Sangh, Socialist and other M.Ps. in our country; because inside the Assembly or the Parliament, they sit together, rise together or laugh at one another. It is said of the British Parliament that it is a club, an exclusive one. There one sits with fellow MPs and shares a bottle. Here, I am not sure about drinks, but they smoke or drinks, coffee or tea together. At the same time, there is this feeling that we are working for the country, making laws for the country. On the one hand, this high feeling of working for one's country, on the other, sitting on high tables and chairs, having great fun in talking and drinking tea or coffee. This is a very natural feeling which cannot be just wiped away, a fault of man's whole physical make-up. Wherever there is parliamentary democracy this getting together of legislators is just inevitable. Our party's poor legislators are all the time being thrown out of

the Assembly houses. And others say this is against parliamentary decorum. Now, the PSP and Swantantra members have gone a step further than the Congress, and have started saying that the socialists are barbarians. The Commnuists say, not 'barbarians' but 'uncivilized' and that they should be punished, but 'don't punish them for seven days', they plead for suspension for a day or two. This happened in the Rajya Sabha when Murahari was thrown out.

This disease of the legislators has crept into our Party also, but as long as we kept to our revolutionary principles, it can never become deep enough a disease. When we come to the crux of the point, how to keep our legislators in correct form, then I would say, you yourselves are not wholly right. If the legislators are horses. who are the riders to keep the reins in hand ? The people. Our constituencies are so large and scattered that MLAs or MPs become riderless horses. Hence the reins on the legislators are in the hands of the committees, particularly the constituency committees of the party. Some horses are excellent and it is of utmost importance to ride and rein such a horse. But the constituency members instead of becoming the riders and holding the reins they themselves become horses, as the legislators have the money, offer tea, eats and the constituency committee members become the servants of the legislators. Such a committee cannot just make the legislators serve them. So in the ultimate analysis, the fault lies with the committee members.

Question. 5 : If parties which want to bring about revolution unite, what would be the future of India ?

Answer : You are suggesting that these people should come together. The question is : which individuals and parties are revolutionary ? I am not prepared today to accept that Communist and Jana Sangh parties have the potentialities for revolution; they of course, want change. I take the Praja Socialist Party to be a party of *status quo*, but because we were once one, we can come together if they accept our principles. Not only the PSP, there are individuals in the Congrsss also who were with us before 1946. The same rule applies to them. As I have said, I take the communists and the Jan Sangh to be parties of change, but can we merge together ? In relation to property, the communists are comparatively radical : even there, some communists are a bit hesitant now. They want only foreign

property to be nationalized. It is a separate question as to what happens to the civil servants after nationalisation, what salaries they get and so on. All key industries should be nationalised, whether foreign or native; it is another thing to lay emphasis on foreign capital in one's speeches. In matters of property, the communists *can be* nearer to us. I do not say they *are*. Similarly, in the matter of language. the Jan Sangh can be nearer to us, since they may come along with us in our struggle against the English language. But in other spheres, Jan Sangh has distorted views as in the relationship between India and Pakistan, between Hindu and Muslims or in the matter of property. Communists have distorted views regarding the individual, the community, international relations and in the matter of caste. In the matter of caste, all parties, except ours, have a distorted attitude. We can, of course, start dialogue with them about these things, not among the leaders but among the workers and let there be public debates on such public issue. In that process their wrong things come in the open and our wrong traits will also come up to the surface. I am absolutely certain that we have the best principles. But when we try to implement these principles, we are the same as others. Laziness, groupism, disunity, lack of truthfulness and lack of organization, all these defects will come to the fore and a new way out may emerge.

If all these parties get together in such a process, perhaps something may come up. But it is a tremendously difficult task. To begin, one can debate on it only. If the Socialist Party ever becomes Number Two (after the Congress) in the Lok Sabha, since these are the days of the legislators, then our party will be able to draw others also to our fold. Individuals in other parties who have a universalist mind, will be easily drawn to us. Remember, we caannot achieve anything by making high sounding statements about other parties whether in abuse or praise. One should have a balanced mind so that while enumerating their bad points one would also say the good points. For example, in earlier days, the Socialist Party used to call the communists traitors. If you talk in this manner, leave aside meeting points, you cannot even have a talking point with them. Moreoever, it is not correct to call them traitors. The communists call themselves internationalists. Anti-communists call them traitors. Instead of using these two phrases, I describe them as dependent on foreign powers. To

call somebody a traitor is often an abuse. Taking foreign money may be one of the criteria. But you cannot call somebody a a traitor only on this ground.

Question. 6 : What is different in our approch to revolution and that of Marx ?

Answer : We have talked at length on caste; poor Marx, what did he know of such a thing as caste ? Marx was not aware of the fact that along with class difference, there is also caste difference, and for that it is essential to carry on caste struggle along with class struggle. Marx had accepted the principle of equal opportunity and with that he believed a new society would be born in the world. For the first time, a new principle has come to the forefront, and I shall stretch it further a bit, as I am speaking on my behalf Don't think it is part and parcel of the principles of the Socialist Party. What I have to say is this that there is a swing between caste and class in the history of mankind. When a class becomes static, strong and still, then it becomes a caste. A static class can be called a caste, as a fluid caste can be called a class. In India class has remained so immobile as can hardly be found anywhere in the world, it has become caste. But the oscillation between class and caste always has taken place in the world, and till now it osciallates. In India the tilt toward caste has become so strong that caste has taken deep roots, and to finish this caste is not possible through the principle of equal opportunity. The principle of preferential opportunity is the new theory. Without this principle of preferential opportunity, caste cannot be abolished and this oscillation between caste and class cannot be removed from world. Another difference between the Marxian approach and ours centres round satyagraha or civil disobedience and non-violence. Thirdly, we aim at a world Parliament based on adult suffrage, the Marxists do not. Fourthly, you can consider such things as Seven Revolutions. If you want to find out the differences between Karl Marx and our Socialist principles you won't get them in one article. These are scattered in several writings on caste, non-violence and *satyagrha*, world organisation, seven revolutions etc., which are not only relevant to India but to the world as well.

As far as the progress of history is concerned, such things out not to be made the tenents of a party. These things are always debatable, and belong to the intellect. Don't accept any

one belief as a part of party principles, it will make an ass of you. My understanding of the historical laws can be put in the following nutshell : One, oscillation between caste and class, then shift of power and properity from one region to the other. Thirdly, physical and cultural approximation of man. These three elements have always existed in human history. The class-struggle theory of Karl Marx comes into this class-caste-struggle. For Marx the class struggle was the only thing. A man like me adds a few more things. But it is only a manner of saying. In reality one does not add or delete in such things. It is an integrated approach, with its own inherent logic. It is absured to try to bring something from here, another thing from there and produce a synthesis. Such a thing will be a hotch-potch.

Question 7 : What according to your thinking is the difference between the socialist concept of art and literature and that which exists in Russia ?

Answer: All these questions are intellectual pastimes, particularly for a person like me. Anyway, my first answer is that if there is a socialist government then the legislators of the assemblies or the Parliament and the literarians and artists should sit together and thrash out the issues. If I try to give an answer as to what it shoud be it may sound akin to that of Russia. Don't take my answer to be final, when I suggest an understanding between men of letters and artists on the one hand, and the legislators on the other, please remember that apart from the central government, the district and village assemblies would also have their say. While there would be a four-pillar state, within the country, there would be a fifth pillar, too, in the shape of a world government. In such a decentralised framework there can't be any monster of a government which would suppress writers and artists. There ought to be dissent among the artists, and artists and writers will, in their separate ways, try to preserve themselves. Suppose, the Central Government did not like a particular style of writing or thinking, a village government might like it. The freedom of writers and artists can be achieved through this dissent between the central and the village governments. Apart from this, I suppose the writers and artists will have their own organisations. Moreover, if there is a genius among the writers and artists, who is intensely committed to his art in his own bohemian way, who can suppress him unless the socialist government passes a law which will be

imposed on him? There should be full freedom even in laws. According to laws of the present regime of Russia, nobody, on his own, can publish a book. I wonder if there is any country in the world, where a man by himself can publish a book. I make it very clear that no socialist government will ever pass laws to censor art or literature, even what is known as pronography. This is my personal opinion. Maybe, regarding pronography some rules will be framed. There must be complete freedom in art and literature. Writers, poets and artists denied the patronage of publishers, will have the freedom to recite or put up an exhibition on the streets. Some writers can have a small printing press to print their books and distribute them, and if there is something extraordinary, it will achieve its own miracle.

I have one more thing to say, there are some changes coming over the communists. Even when there were none, Picasso was a Communist. When we come to think of it, it is a tribute to communism, why such a great artist like Picasso, even for the sake of saying, should be with the communists? While keeping in mind the faults of the communists, one must admit that there is someting which attracts such a great artist as Picasso. Anatole France is another great name. His life was rather unique. Upto the age of 40 or 55, he was a rightist, a conservative in matters of religion or property. Then he became a socialist at the age of 50 or 55. Then at the age of 70 or 75, he became a communist and remained so. One of his sayings is pretty well-known, that the world will be a funny place if one becomes young again after old age. The pity is that youth precedes old age, and I too say if old age comes before youth, then the world will be a really wonderful place to live in. The wisdom and experience of old age coupled with the physical and mental strength of youth would make life wonderful. In reality this cannot happen, But in early youth, a boy of 15, 16 or 18 or a girl of 20 might do well to think of such a change in precedence. Not that I advocate such a thing. What I have in mind is that a man in old age should not be past-looking, conservative, hypocrite or rightist although he should be more wary and careful. A man should ever go forward, remain a revolutionary.

I am not praising the communists. I consider the communist ideology monstrous. Only I accept in general, its principle regarding property, that is should be socialised. According to me

all property except that which a single family can work out without hiring labour must be socialised, or in five or ten years, or seeing the conditions in some places, fiften in place of five or ten years. Along with that, we have another principle which is not found in Communism or in Russia. That too is a guideline. The principle of possible and absolute equality. Possible equality will allow income disparities within a range of one to ten. As we progress and prosper, it could be lowered to 1 to 5 or 1 to 3. If the agricultural labourer gets 3 ruppees, others at the highest levels should not get more than Rs. 30. Theory and practice should go hand in hand together, there should be a two way traffic between the two, each influencing the other, and both going forward. If man gives up practical considerations altogether, then from the human point of view, he is mad, and if he gives up idealism, theory we call him an opportunist. Theory and practice must always be debated together. A man in politics must always find a balance between the two, so that both practice and theory can march forward.

I have to refer to Picasso because even though he is a communist, the communists found fault with his peace pigeon. Picasso's Pigeon was a tired pigeon, with the head a bit down, even in flight. They felt bad that their own artist, and such a great one had made their pigeon so tired looking. For the communists, the pigeon is like what a cow is to the Hindus or now what a peacock would be to the Indians. Whatever it is, the artist had given his own expression.

But Russia has tortured a thousand artists, with imprisonment and other punishments, who knows how many writers and painters have been put behind bars, and how many put to death. And it was not such a simple injustice in Russia. Now-a-days, the Russians are abusing Stalin so much that I have to defend him. I have never had any love for Stalin. I had a balanced view about him, one of my considerations was that he belonged to a backward region. Khruschev belonged to the advanced, European region of the Soviet Union. Stalin was a Georgian, from that point of view an Asian. But that is an irrelevent point. Stalin's mind and attitude belonged to a backward region. We also belong to a backward country. From the human point of view, however, I prefer Khruschev to Stalin. Now Russians themselves are abusing Stalin. They have dug up his body from the ground and have

buried it elsewhere. Primarily, I am against preserving a dead body. So I would like to tell them, take this to its logical conclusion, and dig up Lenin's body as well.

Even Russia has produced a Pasternak. The free atmosphere of Paris produced a Picasso, but even in the imprisoned air of Russia a Pasternak has been born. I have always held that no system can imprison man's mind for a very long period. I have been told that I do not know what terrible might communism has, what Russia is, and that I do not know that if once communism comes to a country, it is impossible to free onself from it. I have insisted that like any other ideology even a communist ideology can be got rid of. As a matter of fact, if Russia had not intervened, Hungary would have been liberated. I think, it is incorrect to say that any ideology can have complete command over man's mind, soul and intellect. It is true that a monster can rule over a period of thirty, forty or fifty years. Have we anything less than a monster here ? We may not be after all so weak, but in a manner of saying, I feel sometimes like a deer at bay. Then I feel that there is a monster of a society, a monster of a government. I do not usually read all the newspapers, particularly what they say about me. In the beginning things were said about Pasternak in a secretive manner, then he was attacked publicity. The difference is that—I do not ever know if there is a difference—Pasternak must have had friends at the early stage. If not, how could his book come out ? Among his friends there must have been foreign communists, some of his own countrymen too, but very few. Today, in India my friends are there in the open and maybe their numbers can be increased. That is a great difference, and I cannot deny that.

Question 8 : What was the relationship between the Asian Socialist Conference and the Socialist Party ? Why didn't you attend the conference ?

Answer : Actually, it was I who had organised the Asian Socialist Conference. But now it is all over. Take it that I did not participate in it. But if there was some positive good in it, it would have continued. But the Asian Socialist Conference is today almost dead or three-fourths dead. I do not know if there is any office of the Conference at the moment, or if there is any work to do. There was an element of imperialism in European Socialism, it also lacked revolutionism. More propaganda and meetings,

less of satyagraha and things of that kind, and aligned either with Russia or America. These inadequacies of European Socialism had led us to make an attempt to organise the Asian Socialists. The idea was to build up a Socialist Organisation in the world which would not be tied up with imperialism, with Russian communism, or American capitalism, and be different from the aimlessness or non-revolutionism of the western socialists. There were difficulties before me. At the beginning, I had talks with the Burmese and the Indonesian socialists, but my first joint statement was with the Japanese socialists. I had three or four sittings with the Japanese socialists. They told me to write the draft and they scrutinised each and every sentence of it. At that time I come to know the Japanese mind. They were always careful to find the effect of each and every sentence, that is, the immediate effect, and not an effect for hundred years to come. The Japanese mind, the Japanese socialist mind would always look for this immediate effect and would always weigh the *pros* and *cons* of it of every theory, principle etc. Anyway, after changes here and there, a joint statement was prepared. Then the Burmese and the Indonesians came along. But when I perceived that the very nature of the Indian socialists was undergoing a change, then I thought what could I do there, at the conference ! What revolutionism can Asian socialists teach the European socialists when we lacked it here ? Here they were trying to spin the ball of revolution and at the same time looking wishfully at the ball in the hands of the ruling party. That is why I did not attend the conference, but attending or not was a minor detail.

At the time when this attempt to organise the Asian Socialists was made there was no talk of going with the government, or even if it were there, it was not very clear in 1949-51. This become crystal clear in 1952-53. After long efforts, the conference was held in 1953. The lack of revolutionary spirit in the Socialist Movement in India began in 1953, i.e., talks with the Congress, exchange of letters and interviews with Mr. Nehru, all these started in 1953. tn Rangoon, as a matter of fact some of my colleagues had spoken in favour of Nehru. When I came to know of all this, I was not prepared to have a sh.wdown, and for this I beat a retreat. For a similar reason I did not attend the Madras Party Conference in 1950. At that time, the issue was the Korern War. And the dispute between Achyut Patwardhan and Jaiprakash

Narayan resulted in pressurising me to become the General Secretary, and I was not prepared to become so. Day and night all these squabbles and this pressurisation were really terrible. All these were taking a bad turn and I thought it would be better for me to stay away, and things may sort out themselves. This was my first thought.

Now, you have raised the issue, so let me explain. It has been the custom in the Communist Party that whoever becomes the General Secretary, he remains as such for ten, fifteen, or twenty years as Stalin was. I did not approve of this, that the same man should continue to be the General Secretary, in the Congress Socialist Party or the Socialist Party. It was no good for the health, democracy and for the ideology of the Party, and I used to say this openly. Jaiprakashji had been, for years, the General Secretary, and I did my best to remove him from this post. I used to say frankly, to him also, why should he keep on to this post for such a length of time, he should get out of it. My mind was clear on this point, therefore, I could say all this, if I had myself wanted the post, then things would have been different. Moreover, one should be clear about this not only in mind but also in behaviour. That is why I didn't bother who would succeed him. That was the crux of the point, and at that juncture the Korean war issue came up. Most amongst us were of the opinion that North Korea had invaded South Korea, therefore, we should support the latter and we as well as the UNO should come to the aid of South Korea to save her independence. I told these people not to act in this manner. The criterion of the UNO in this regard not quite alright, do not accept it, There was a long argument on this, and it became heated up and I felt I was being drained off, I was too upset. This was a few days before the Madras Conference. Then I felt there would be quite a showdown, then decided not to attend the conference. I was not prepared to quarrel at that time, or at any time, for that matter, till I was compelled. It would have been an inevitably open quarral had I been at the Madras conference. The speech that was delivered on the resolution on the Korean war, I heard later, said that Lohia too, was of the same opinion, which was a total lie. I was always against it, and a few delegates had opposed that resolution. Had I been there, the resolution would have been defeated and the split would have taken place in 1950.

At times I think, why did I waste these five-seven years. But my weakness was that I did not want to quarrel. Going to Rangoon or Madras, I felt would have led to quarrels. Now my wisdom and experince have made me take up the quarrel. Without any hitch, laughing over, I can quarrel, and say things. At once I was badly caught, when Mahatma Gandhi died. There was a big Press Conference in Delhi, attended by 70 or so pressmen from here and abroad. We had given out a prepared statement in which we had accused the Government for Gandhiji's assassination. The statement was originally drafted in such a fashion that it seemed Sardar Patel was made responsible for the murder. But I had changed that sentence. I had said that if this sentence was kept, I would not sign the statement. I was of the opinion that the entire government should be blamed, not only Sardar Patel. If Patel's name was to be brought in, Nehru's name also should be there. The statement was delayed for some days, and people came to know about it. The Police and Sardar Patel must have come to know of it. The "Hindu" representative knew of it. The Statement was alright, but at the Press conference, it explaining Jai Prakash blamed Sardar Patel most. At that moment, the "Hindu" representative asked me straightaway whether I was of the same opinion. I knew either from the police or from Sardar Patel, he had got the information. But I kept silent, as I didn't know then; I smiled, what else could I do ? At that time I did not like to quarrel among ourselves. Had it been now, I would have said "No, I consider both Patel and Nehru equally guilty. He thinks Nehru is less guilty, I would say he is more guilty." At this some people would have laughed, but things would have cleared up. Perhaps I did not know then, or I was not prepared for a quarrel. I did not know that such things can be said with a smile.

PART II

33

DEVELOPMENT OF LOHIA'S THOUGHTS

OM PRAKASH DEEPAK

Rammanohar Lohia belonged to that generation of intellectuals, which grew up during the revolutionary period between the two world wars. That was the period when people dreamt of creating a new civilization based on equality and prosperity. Inspite of serious differences and even antagonisms a world brotherhood of revolutionaries existed. Bolshevik revolution took place in 1917. Three years after, Gandhiji launched his civil disobedience in India. The centre of all thought was *man*, his future and his new civilization.

It was natural to have differences within the framework of a new civilization. And, therefore, like others of his generation, Lohia too felt that the anti-imperialist struggles of India and other dependent countries, the socialist and the communist movements of the world, democratic and humanitarian ideas, in spite of their mutual differences, were taking the world inevitably to a new civilization based on equality. So great was the optimism of those days, that it was nothing supprising for Lohia to think that soon the whole world would be converted into one race or mixed blood.

Despite certain obvious distortions, the Soviet Union appeared to be a new experiment in this new civilization—the state that belonged to peasants and workers. In the normal sense of the term Lohia was never a Marxist, but in the beginning he also thought the same about Russia. His belief got its first big shock

when in 1936-37 Stalin began to liquidate his erstwhile colleagues of the Bolshevik revolution. The last manifestation of the revolutionary spirit of this age was the Spanish civil war in which youth from several countries participated and became martyrs. Revolution was defeated in the battle field in Spain. Still the overall situation was not completely hopeless. It appeared that counter-revolution was fighting its last battle in the shape of fascism and with its defeat, the road to a new civilization would be opened. But when in 1938 Stalin entered into a non-aggression pact with Hitler, for men like Lohia, there was no longer any basic difference between the Soviet Union and the anti-revolutionary, so called democratic countries of the West. There was no hope left that western civilization could rise above its own limitations. When during the Quit India' movement in 1942 the communists performed the job of informers for the British, Lohia's distate for communism reached the point of revolution.

Another experiment in the development of a new civilization was being carried on in India. That was the movement for the freedom and development of the Asian and African countries. Disillussioned with the European Marxists and other traditional socialists, Lohia formulated his independent philosophy. It's focal point was the Indian national movement led by Gandhiji, which the Indian Socialist was a radical part.

In 1938 Lohia for the first time propounded the theory of the third camp. In 1954, by envisaging the possibility of an Asian lingua franca as well as a language of the whole world, he gave the final touches to his concept of new civilization. During this period of sixteen years, he propounded his theories on economics, politics and the philosophy of history.

It is interesting to find that Lohia has not discussed the various aspects of his philosophy at any one place in detail. One gets his thoughts in parts and in aspects. This might have been characteristic of his thought process, as he hinted at one place. But surely, one reason also was that his personality was a total one. In this very span of sixteen years Lohia led the 'Quit India' movement, organised revolts in Goa and Nepal, assisted Gandhiji in his pacification works in ths riot affected areas of Calcutta, Noakhali and Delhi, organised Hind Kishan Panchayat, and Asian Socialist Conference after a world-wide tour, got arrested five or six times, stayed underground for about two years and spent three

and a half years in jail, which included the torture he was subjected to in the Lahore jail for about a year and half. Such a man could formulate his ideas only in parts. But there is a harmony and consistency in all his ideas. Even the small things he talked about were harmoniously related to the rest of his ideas.

What was the picture of Lohia's now civilization? His fundamental beliefs were same as before 1938. In 1966, about a year before his death, when Lohia used to talk mostly about concrete programmes, he described 'equality and prosperity' as the best definition of socialism. After 1938, he came to believe that the modern civilization of the West could not forsake its one sidedness, and could not with it's own efforts successfully achieve fulfilment and totality. Outside western civilization, it was in Gandhi's India that some new values were being established. It was natural therefore for Lohia to see the possibilities of a new civilization being born in India.

The centre of this new civilization was man's total personality, in which thought and action were not divergent, and which, apart from being active, was balanced and limited. And along with this was added human compassion. It is obvious that the development of such a personality could be achieved only in a social order based on maximum possible equality. First of all, Lohia wrote on the economic aspect of the problem.

Modern western civilization has accomplished quite a high degree of socio-economic equality within the national frontiors of the respective countries unmatched by any society' in the past. But the economic prosperity which made this achievement possible was due to the colonial exploitation of the two-third coloured humanity by the one-third white Euro-Americans. Lohia talked of equality not only within a nation but also amongst nations. That is, there could be some little differences in power and prosperity among various nations, but none should be able to dominate over others. The circumstances in which industrialisation took place in Europe cannot be repeated elsewhere. Therefore, the attempt to achieve industrial development on the Euro-American pattern would be fruitless and destructive. To solve this problem, Lohia, suggested economic planning on the basis of small-machine technology. Lohia's small-machine technology was not the same as handloom or cottage industry, but small machine which could be run with the help of electricity, oil or atomic power and which

would need comparatively smaller capital investment to increase productivity. Another aspect of this was that labour should have direct, contact with his machine, that man should not be subordinated to machine, instead man should direct the machine and he its master. A pre-requisite for this was that capital and the means of production should be under social ownership. No man should be hired for labour by another.

Along with 'social ownership', was the related question of putting a check on the state becoming a totalitarian monster. Lohia's answer to this was the concept of decentralised state—the Four Pillar State—tó disburse the power of the state, not only between the Centre and States, but also amongst the districts and the villages. The economic principle called for the installation of heavy machines only when and where it was necessary, and small machines as far as possible, Parallel to this economic doctrine as the political doctrine that only that much power should rest with the centre and the province as is essential, e.g., the Army and the Armed Police, and as far as possible more and more power should be given to the district and the village, as ordinary police in districts and all developmental works in villages. For equality among nations and for world civilization, the fifth pillar was the world parliament elected on the basis of adult franchise and a world government with limited powers.

Lohia adopted Gandhiji's satyagraha in the from of civil-disobedience, which was a combination of human compassion and balanced activity. Reason, by itself, is not sufficient. But the power of violenae is not always on the side of reason or justice. Besides, violence succeeds only against a weaker enemy. Lohia's conception of civil-disobedience was reason's power. Through it reason can meet force of other kinds, but it won't harm the society in any way. Along with this, he propounded the principle of 'immediacy' that there is only a difference of time between the long term aim and the short term programme and therefore, every work should have its justification in itself.

Lohia said that there are no rigid laws of history; but only some guiding factors, because in every situation there are alternatives, though they are limited alternatives. While explaining the rise and fall of civilization, Lohia said that uptill now, all the civilizations had been one-sided and regional. Because of the one-sidedness of every civilizations, like the primitive dinosaurs it

collapses under its own weight of uni-dimensional progress, or it stagnates. As a result, when the society is dynamic, it remains divided into loose and flexible classes, and when it stagnales these classes ossify into castes.

Lohia said that today in the world such situations exist in which the inequality of ossified castes and the inequality of flexible classes and in goth the cases, the cycle of injustice and exploitation, regionalism and violence could be broken and a world civilisation could be created, which would be free all exploitation, in which man would be unbound, prosperous and happy, and in a position to develop its full personality.

So long as Gandhiji was alive, Lohia held the faith that the Indian national movement would be in the lead in the march to the new civilization. In a letter to Harold Laski in 1945, Lohia had expressed the hope that when the Congress gets the opportunity of developing a state it would strive to do so on the principles of Ahimsa. But in 1946 the Congress Working Committee felt that Ahimsa was only a policy and not an article of faith. And after independence the Congress propounded the disastrous thesis that while not only the right of organised violence but aiso the right of organised peaceful resistance could not be given to the people, the state had every right to indulge in violence without checks.

However, even after Gandhiji's the situation seemed to be hopeful. One after another, nations of Asia were becoming independent; in Africa, too, the national movements were gaining momentum. In European politics leftist trends were emerging very strong, and Tito's rebellion indicated cracks in communism too. The movement for world government was also vocal. But by 1954 this situation was completely changed. European socialist movement fell a victim to cold war politics. The Asian Socialist Conference to which Lohia gave shape after extensive tours of Asia, proved a cripple. No doubt, Tito could free Yugoslavia from Russian hegemony, but he perpetuated his personal dictatorship. In fact, after 1950 the forces of new civilization and of the third camp were unable to make any headway. In Yugoslavia, Lohia's friend Milovan Djilas was imprisoned. Later in Congo, Lumumba was assassinated; in Pakistan, Khan Abdul Gaffar Khan continued to suffer detention; and Lohia himself was a frequent visitor to jails.

For sometime, western civilization had to retreat politically; however, since its economic and cultural influence held its, dominance, it could regain its political influence with the help of those forces. The western nations were instrumental in building in their colonies of Asia and Africa a class of elite, which was west-oriented and which believed in aping the external manifestations of western mode of living and behaviour. And it was this elite group which replaced the colonial masters. Then, the Euro-American did every thing to perpetuate the rule of this elite class. By the end of 1954, it was obvious that Lohia's attempt to make the Indian socialist a movement competent instrument for the the new civilization proved unsuccessful.

In the latter half of the 20th century the political map of the world had completely changed. Imperialism acquired an indirect and subtle shape. There was no direct political control, but the inequality in productive power continued to increase as a results of which exploitation of Asia-Africa continued. The power of the state increased tremendously and the new ruling classes of these Afro-Asian countries were lured by the Euro-Americans. This process went so far as to make it impossible for any indigenous radical politics to grow in these countries.

Lohia knew it fully well, that without organised political power, no effective instrument could be made for the creation of a new civilization. In India he saw the Bhoodan movement becoming ridiculous day by day, After Bhoodan, Gramdan, Jiwandan etc., there is the talk of Bihar-dan. Tomorrow it may be Desh-dan, and the Bhoodans would be satisfied that they have created a revolution. Likewise the peace movement in Europe, inspite of the large public support, failed becaue it could not influence the organised political power. For the same reason, even the movement against racial inequality in America inspite of its sacrifices and civil disobedience became victim of a stalemate.

In such conditions the only course left for Lohia was to re-open the path of arrested revolution in India. For this, he put his figures on such forces and problems which are hindrances to this path and organised extensive struggles against these the dominance of English language, Caste system, intellectual stagnation and slavery, price loot, luxuries of the ruling class, for equality among men and women, for the inculcation of simplicity and devotion to duty, for the defence of the territorial integrity

and the annulment of partition, for the amelioration in the conditions of the poor peasants and for a new method of development in the agriculture and industry. He wanted the socialist Party not only to change the minds of the people on these questions through civil disobedience but also to organise amilitant non-violent group consisting of determined people. On these questions, he tried to change the outlook of his Party, as well as, of other parties, so that these become the subjects of organised politics in the country and through the conflicts in politics, thus generated, such forces would ultimately emerge which could solve these problems.

Lohia saw that such struggles are being waged in various other parts of the world, though not so much within the organised politics as outside for equality of men and women, against the exploitation of a large section of society by a few, against State intervention in the private lives of individual, for peace and against war, for civil disobedience and against violence. Lohia believed that in these struggles victory would come to the forces of change and reconstruction of a new society.

Apart from this, Lohia also faced the biggest question put before the world in the 20th century. Man has invented such weapons as could totally destroy mankind. There are only two alternatives left before mankind, and Lohia believed that by the end of the 20th century mankind has to face these alternatives either through the use of these weapons to destroy the human race itself or to build a new human society in which there could be permanent peace. But Lohia was well aware that verbal-revolutionary and weak India would not be able to help mankind to make the right choice. A weak India without any will and determination taking false pride in an equally weak Army cannot show the path of peace and progress to the rest of the world. Therefore, he dedicated himself to building up an organisation of internal strength of India.

I have no doubt that if man opts for a way of peace and prosperity, and not the suicidal path, then the orientation of such civilization would be more or less in the framework which Lohia had conceived—where there would be equality not only within the nations but also among nations; and that such equality would not be limited to the field of law, but it would embrace economic, political, social, cultural and other areas as well.

Lohia himself was only partly meeting success and man had not faced the final choice when Lohia died. Nevertheless, at this time we must recall what Lohia said about history having no iron laws. History can help man his understanding, but man himself has to elect his options. And for this he has to wage a relentless battle, in every sector and at all times.

In the end I would like to refer to an instance which would indicate the manner in which Lohia's mind worked. It was about March/April 1967, when the Presidential election had become a major political issue, Lohia, in a talk with the Press, said that the new President should be a man of resolute will and an elastic mind. "I have both these qualities, but the electors would not like me." After the journalists had gone Lohia said—with a smile, "If I am made the President, perhaps, my first act would be to disband the army."

34

LOHIA AND THE ORIGINS OF INDIAN FOREIGN POLICY

CHANDRADEV PRASAD

The Role of Rammanohar Lohia as the Secretary of the Foreign Department, All India Congress Committee, (1936-1938).

Lohia was leading a free life in Calcutta. He was unwilling to come to Allahabad for conducting the foreign department at the invitation of Jawaharlal Nehru but the request of Acharya Narender Dev compelled him to visit the city situated on the confluence of Ganga, Yamuna and mythical Saraswati. He was then twenty-six, and within the short span of two-years he laid the foundation of an Indian foreign policy.

Anti-imperialism, Equality and freedom of all nations, No-war and a World state were its main ingredients. These were expressed by Rammanohar Lohia and had the support of Gandhiji.

But both had the common policy of anti-imperialism. In the very beginning, their fundamental differences were not so visible. Lohia had also the knowledge of this difference. Naturally, he had an earnest desire to conduct the foreign department according to his own policies.

Lohia had in mind that the Congress through the foreign department wanted to determine some definite policies. But later no, he perceived that the main purpose of this department would be to make relations between the Indian National Congress and

the International Labour organisations and other organisations of the world. The Indian freedom struggle should be popularised and receive sympathy from all over the world.

Within eight months, the foreign department of All India Congress performed many important works. It achieved world-wide reputation. The Indian freedom movement was made popular in day they were taken to such war-torn and Pakistan raided areas where the roads were just nominal. So they jeeped part of the way over rocky paths and part of the way trudged on foot over stony byeways and were brought back dead tired, only fit to stay in bed with fatigue for the rest of their stay in the valley and the State. My allowing them complete rest for the next two days in the luxurious State Guest, without insisting on their stirring out, earned me their affection and gratitude in the bargain. Much later, when I had the joy of meeting Lohia, I narrated the joke and the spontaneous embrace with the characteristic Lohia chuckle of good humour which I received from him, ever and ever remains fresh in my memory as something of a cherished possession. Suffice to say, that Lohia was lovable and we were lucky who could claim the warmth of his friendship. And lucky indeed is the man whose memorium plaque bears the golden word lovable.

35

LOHIA'S ADDRESS AT THE FISK UNIVERSITY NEGRO SCHOOL IN THE SOUTH

HARRIS WOFFORO JUNIOR

JULY 14, 1951

It was not the plan for Lohia to awaken his first morning in a segregrted Southern community where only Negroes were supposed to live, study and eat. But when his arrest in Mysore delayed him eight days, it was decided not to upset his whole cross-country schedule, but to pick it up as it was, thus reducing his time in New York and Washington where he would have spent his first week. This was in line with the advice of Senator Humphrey, India's most active Congressional friend, who wrote that he hoped Dr. Lohia "will visit our people in their homes, there factories, their farms, and communities and that he will travel extensively beyond Washington and beyond New York. Those two cities, active and interesting as they may be, do not fully reflect the heart, the understanding, and the sentiments of the American people."

Lohia's first audience consisted of Negro and white workers for racial equality from all parts of the country who had assembled at Fisk to assess the year's progress and problems.

"The major conflict today," he told them, "is between those areas which are creating the larger part of the material and cultural goods of the world, and want to preserve what they have created, and, on the other hand, the large part of the world which is not creating such goods, but is striving to create. There is the

East-West conflict, the Atlantic-Soviet struggle, but bigger than that is this conflict between creation and preservation. One part has created and does not know how to preserve; the other part is too poor to create. It is in this larger context that we should view the awakening of Asia and Africa."

He spoke of a notion he had, that if the Negro had held political power during the last four hundred years, if the African continent had been free, or had been subjecting Europe, then aesthetic and philosophical concepts would be very different. For instance, the standards of beauty for a Venus would not be the same. The new continental awakening may now affect such things.

He told how the powers in Europe were becoming Africa-conscious; that is, they were wondering if what they used to get out of Asia could now come form Africa. He asked how many had heard of the post-war massacres in Madagascar. He called on Americans, especially Negro Americans, to take up the cause of Africa.

All Africa is astir. The time is now come when Africa should make a concerted effort for freedom.

To the question, will Africans use their freedom well, I say the question is frivolous and has no meaning—which people has used its freedom well ? When I look at the history of the last 400 years of modern civilization, I have grave doubts whether it is so North imitating.

There is no douht but that when Africa is liberated, and African peoples are represented in the United Nations, it will have a great effect on race relations in the United States. It is not only for the advance of two hundred millions in Africa, but for the advance of mankind as a whole that we must pray for the success of African liberation. We in Asia are pledged to give moral and material support.

Then he turned to "one aspect which needs consideration—this desire of modern civilization for a continually rising standard of living."

"I'm not one who makes merit of his own sins and says there is virtue in poverty. Poverty must be abolished—but this ever increasing standard of living is the common urge of modern civilization, shared both by Mr. Henry Ford and Mr. Joseph Stalin, and the systems built on this urge are much the same. This urge has had great and estimable features—it brought the

European part of mankind to a point where bodily wants are nearly satisfied, and great equality has been achieved.

By the way, I'm not one who talks of spiritual accomplishments and spiritual equality when there is terrible economic inequality. I may say that the West has so far come closest to equality—at a sidewalk cafe it is hard to tell a laundress from a duchess, but modren civilization has approached a blind alley, I do not believe that the large scale machine, the large scale factory which produces goods in great numbers, is capable of abolishing the poverty of the larger part of mankind.

Consider these two sets of figures. In India the density of population is about 300 per square mile; in the U.S. it is about 50. In India the capital equipment—productive tools—per person is about $ 35; in the U.S. it is more than $ 1500. These figures, taken together, tell the mystery of what has happened and what will happen in Asia.

If India used large scale technolgy, a hundred million people would need to be liquidated. If our agriculture were mechanized on this basis over 80 million farmaers would be driven into the cities. I know that capitalists and communists alike say that large scale industry would absorb them. But there is one snag : to absorb them our capital equipment per person would need to be raised from $ 35 to about $ 1000, and this would take, hundreds of billions of dollars. For this task, Point Four, or all of Stalin's roubles, would be a scratch on the surface.

No, the solution lies in revising our nations of civilization, specifically as to the kind of technical equipment which is necessary.' If we are to force ourselves out of the ruts into which we have fallen, we must change from the goal of an ever-increasing standard of living, to that of a decent standard of living. Today, anyone to be listened to, must pay homage to mass production and in system, but I suggest that twenty years hence anyone who wants to benefit mankind must operate inside the concept of a decent standard of living.

Modern civilization at least is active. Asia and Africa have not been that active, and in the last 300 years have been sothful. I'm not an Indian who speaks of the past spiritual glories of his country. Whatever the past or the future, our present is muck. The most denominating character of my part of the world is sloth and indolence.

But don't run away, when I say you are active, with the idea that I think your way is all very estimable. The activity of the West is now mostly strife. Strife and sloth are equally disgusting. Behind both, however, are the nobler qualities—activity and poise. When we combine these two, then will be the beginning of a new human civilization, a civilization in which poverty is abolished with a decent living standard, a civilization in which there is equality, both material and of the spirit. Thus will end one phase of human history—the alternating rise and fall of groups and peoples, the regional and continental shifts, in power and spirit.

Perhaps history is to be repeated; and these two vast continents will rise up for their exclusive benefit, and once again Europe and the U.S. will be underdogs. I would not like that to happen. It has happened too frequently for the health of the human race. I do not want America and Europe to go under—and I say this partly in charity and sympathy—because do not imagine that the power of Western civilization is impressive all around ! Cannot, instead, we combine what you have achived with what we need to create, for the good of all ?"

He closed with a story that took place 18 yenrs ago—"which was beginning of my fascination with the American people." An American girl in Berlin and asked him to call on her when he came to Paris. He and another Indian friend went to her apartment, but the concierge would not let two coloured men go up. So they phoned her to come to a sidewalk cafe, which they preferred anyway.

She came down in tears and thouht some damage had been done to civilization. This made me think that there is something good in America—anyway, that the American women are very good and fine. She was standing up for her bill of rights. No European girl would have done this, she would be too civilized. But the American is still primitive enough to show her symapathy and cry for her convictions. That was Maxine.

And then there was Josephine Baker. At that time she was taking Paris by storm and she took me by storm, too.

It makes no difference—in Tripoli the lips are thick, in Paris the lips are thin, in Berlin the skin is fair, in Nashville the skin is dark, but 'underneath, my treasure, all else is the same.'

It was not the usual kind of talk, and the questions afterward, when students took him to a restaurant, were not of the usual

order. The conversation, about a decent standard of living and how it could be lived was difficult because a jouk box was constantly playing loud music, such as the song, "Mr. and Mississippi".

Lohia lunched at the home of Dr. Charles Johnson, the first Negro president of Fisk. It was perhaps the most elegant and formal meal he had in America. This, and the conversation with several of the well-to-do Negroes there, gave him his first glimpse of the middle and upper-class Negro. Lohia tried to arouse their interest in Africa. One woman, who had probably all her life tried to disassociate herself from the African, announced aloofly that she was no more interested in Africa than in Argentina. Lohia, a little angry, replied, "Well I am." He argued that the freedom of Africa was now one of the most creative ideas on this earth, and that he, at least, felt a strong tie of kinship to every African.

Before he felt, Lohia talked about Negro strategy with President Johnson, who had closed the Institute with a survey of the legal steps taken toward racial equality and of the remaining, heavy obstacles. Since Dr. Johnson had been to India and was well acquainted with the Gandhian struggle, Lohia asked him simply, "Why not a little jail going ? Resist some of this injustice directly, and non-violently, and go to prison if required ?" Dr. Johnson seemed sad as he stood in his parlor, shaking his head negatively, "No we're not like India. We are such a minority here, just thirteen million."

After recording a radio interview, Lohia was driven from Nashville to Highlander Folk School at Monteagle, in the hills of South Tennessee. This was the first leg of a four day 800 mile automobile trip through the 'Black Belt' of the 'Deep South', and the irrigated, electrified land of the T.V.A.

As we passed Andrew Jackson's home, we told Lohia one story out of American history which he had not heard—and there were few such occasions, since his knowledge of U.S. history surpassed that of most of his guides. When this rugged Tennessee general went to Washington as victor in a great extension of power away from the established Eastern seaboard, he held an "open house" in the White House to which the little people who had elected him came from hundreds of miles. Lohia was delighted with the picture of the wild turmoil of Jackson's inauguration, when the capital belonged to the farmers and mountaineers of Tennessee.

"That is what we need in India," he said.

Lohia also liked the stories about the stubborn man from Missouri now in the White House, who may not be literary but writes his full letters, who may not have the people's reverence but seem to have faith in the people. He particularly enjoyed Truman's remark to John Hersey; "I'm saving up four or five good, hard punches on the nose, and when I'm out of this job I'm going to run around and deliver them personally."

"I think I like Truman better than Roosevelt," Lohia remarked. "Truman is one of the people, and that is better than being a spokesman for the people. He uses crude language, he swears, he defends his daughter, but I like this rough vitality." When Lohia was told that Louis Fisher suspected his admiration of 'vitality', he answered, "Louis can say that, because he has plenty of vitality and lives in a land of vitality."

In the late afternoon we reached Highlander, to find several dozen farmers and coal miners, and that many more children, sitting on the grass, awaiting the "Hindu visitor".

The Folk school was started in 1932 by Myles Horton, a Tennessee farm boy, who, after studying economics at the University of Chicago, and investigating Scandinavian Folk Schools on a trip to Denmark, came back with a dream of a changed South. He decided to begin an inter-racial school which would serve as a training centre for farm, union and community leaders. Today, Highlander is an outpost of the struggling Southern labour movement. It is owned and run co-operatively, with labour, such as dishwashing, shared equally—a sort of 'ashram' in the Tennessee hills.

While discussing American plumbing of which he approved, and India's lack of such things, Lohia was interrupted by a farmer who said that he didn't have such things either. A little surprised, Lohia asked how many of them had running water ? Only one or two. Most told him they had only a well, with no electric pumps, no sewage system, none of the "modern" conveniences. They argued that most rural communities were like this. "At least most mountain people," some qualified. He found that there were two teachers for all eight grades of school; that if the number of children fell below forty there would be but one teacher.

"Then you don't have these fine showers ?" he asked. The habit of overhead showers appealed to him, especially in comparision

to the European invention—the bathtub, in which one washes in one's own dirt, something particularly obnoxious to Hindus who shower at least once a day. He got the group to confess that "once a week" was a good guess on the average for bath-taking. "Too bad," he joked, "I thought an affinity for water was to be a common tie with America." (Instead, the time 'lost' by Lohia's lengthy morning shower was a constant irritant to all of his guides).

Lohia talked for a while, about the need for village people to get together in this world, about his doubts concerning modern civilization, about his desire to see a different structure, in which power would reside not primarily in the federal and state governments, but as well in the districts and the villages—the four pillar state.

"In Yugoslavia this week I was in villages like yours, and there too, I found friendliness; we felt like brothers, there was a kinship. To remove the two great evils, hunger and fear, something of this kinship must take place all over the world. Let's do it then, and build a better civilization than the world has known. In Israel I saw something of this, in a co-operative settlement where the villagers have built a museum and an art gallery".

Someone asked him why people voluntarily went to jail in India. "Well, under the British, it was natural. Youth threw their tea in the harbor, we burned some of their cloth. But mainly Gandhi invited us to get the British out by our own suffering, by refusing to obey them and going to jail. If we continue to use this system it is because there is still injustice. There is the usual way to remove injustices, through an election and a change of government every five years. But there is also the way of non-violent direct action, which includes the violation of unjust laws. For instance, we use this way of struggle against our unjust land tenures—what you call sharecropping."

Bill Crawford, for years a coal miner, and now an organizer for the Steelworkers Union, C.I.O., asked if Gandhi hadn't taken an Untouchable into his home. "Yes, he adopted several. but symbolically he took all Untouchables into his home. He became kin of all sufferers. He struck the greatest blow against caste in Indian history, a blow under which it is still reeling."

A college girl, voluntarily in a nearly Work Camp which was building an artificial lake for the community, asked him what

Nehru had failed to do that the Socialists could have done. First, Lohia listed, the abolition of landlordism—something which has been in the Congress platform for years. Second, the redivision of land, both in the interests of justice, and of food. These steps and others establishing equality of sacrifice would make it possible to inspire Indians to devote an hour every day to unpaid co-operative endeavour for economic development—like her Work Camp. With such voluntary village land brigades, and the productive enthusiasm of the people, it would not have been necessary for India to ask for American food.

To a question about Communism, Lohia commented: "I consider Communism as very evil—as the *status quo*. But I would like to issue a warning. The American mind is obsessed with the bogey of Communism. Whenever anything happens, the American ruling powers say it is the big Communist beast. Beast he may be, but he is not so big as that. Communism who in China, but that is a long story, and you are partly responsible for that. But Communism is not winning in Burma, or in India. Look at the Republic of Burma. With insurrections on all sides, with the Communists or the forces of reaction in control of most of the land, still the Republic has succeeded and has recovered its ground, It did this on its own, primarily because it had the native force of democratic socialism".

The dozen or so young people in the Work Camp asked Lohia if he could make use of their team in India. He had talked of volunteer brigades; they were volunteering. He asked what kind of work they would be willing to do. "Any work you need", they replied, "digging ditches, irrigation, clean-up, simple construction, anything". When Lohia saw the crowded tents in which they were living, six or eight to a tent, he laughed that at least he might be able to provide better accommodations in an Indian village. But the food and the life would be different. Were they prepared to stay in an Indian village and work with the villagers for a long period? "Yes", was the answer. "We'll be over, soon as we can get the money for the ship," they told him.

This was a response he met after almost every meeting. The picture of such teams living in Indian villages, working vigorously under the direction of the village panchayat and alongside Indian Socialist volunteers, delighted him. He said it might produce a small example of the combination of Western activity and Asian

poise he was seeking.

The neighbors stayed a long time and some of them came back after supper, to listen and question some more. Myles Hort on commented that this would never have happened if they hadn't liked Lohia. "They can spot a phoney right away. One thing they liked was the way he talked frankly about what's wrong in India, and even criticized his own government. These people have opposed the powers-that-be in America all their life, and they felt kinship with someone doing the same in India".

Myles' mother, who was on one of her infrequent visits to the school, usually kept away from all potitical affairs. An independent mountain woman, she was wary of radicalism, and considered Socialism and Communism all about the same. But she stayed late into the night listening intently to Lohia. "There's an honest man," she said when she left.

Lohia visited the well-stocked library and inspected the film center, where staff members were preparing film strips to be used in Southern union organizing. He looked at one on race relations

Later, the staff assembled to discuss the South, along with Bill Crawford, the Steel workers' director for five Southern states who had driven up from Georgia, and Roy Harris, the composer, and Tom Govan, head of the history department at nearby Sewanee 'University of the South',

"Some of us have been talking all our lives," Myles said, "but we've not gotten so far." Lohia asked why. This led to a discussion of the bosses who buy votes, and of the "Bourbons". Lohia enjoyed hearing that an aristocratic label could be fatal politically : "If a politician gets pinned as a Bourbon, he's ruined".

They stressed the South's crucial position in American politics. Under the seniority system in Congress, "those there the longest rule the roost." Since Southern politics have been run by a fairly static one-party, white, reactionary crowd, who send the same men back to Washington, year after year, "Dixiecrats" get a seniority stranglehold on Congress. "But for the Southern bloc, the Democratic Party could become really forward-moving," someone said.

Once in the depression, when half the country was on unemployment relief, the people around Highlander had organized politically and actually elected their whole slate to country offices. The state government simply refused to deal with them. Later, when things improved, they couldn't stir enough people to lick the

bosses again.

Yet they were full of hope. The South was changing, they agreed, and fast, although not fast enough to satisfy them. They told of some of their experiences at the school, in bringing whites and Negroes together at table and classes, and the later repercussions back home. One white farmer from Albama, Mr. J.D. Mott, whose, family Lohia later visited, shed 52-year accumulation of prejudices while at Highlander. When he returned home, he even broke the age-old taboo against Negroes and whites drinking from the same water dipper. On a hot sizzling afternoon, while his neighbors were all building a fertilizer co-operative, he brought only one water barrel, instead of the usual two. As the thirsty farmers crowded around, he began to provide two dippers, one for each group. But before he could carve "white" on one, the other dipper was in use, indiscriminately. As Myles says, "The farmers themselves were too thirsty to wait for the conventional way of doing business in the South."

Furthermore, they described the often forgotten "Mountain South", the hill country in the corners of seven states. This area had never held many slaves, it generally was friendly to the North in the Civil War, and it was now the hard crore of economic progressivism. "Frontier democracy is still sort of alive here," Myles said. "No Bilbos, Talmadges, Longs were ever sent forth from the mountains. It is this area which produced Senator Estes Kefauver, the only Congressman in the entire South to vote against the Taft-Hartley anti-labour Bill. From here came Cordell Hull and Hugo Black."

Lohia learned of the violent repression used to stop the organising of Southern workers, and also of the tendency of workers to strike back. Myles talked of his problems organizing the small farmers into co-operatives and into the Farmers Union, which he represents in Tennessee.

"But the biggest change is the Negro vote," someone added. In the last few years, a million additional Negroes were voting. There were millions more soon to come into suffrage, especially in the South.

Lohia was intrigued with the picture of family mobility he was given. "In America we are all on the move," Myles argued. "I doubt if anyone in this room was born in the same state as his father." There was disagreement but someone added. "In five

generations my family has lived in five different states."

The discussion finally focused on the problem of decentralization. "The trouble here is that it is the bottom which is the most corrupt," Myles said. "Federal appointments are fairly good, but the corruption comes in the direct elections, city and country. I bet you couldn't find five honest Justices of the Peace In Tennessee."

Couldn't this be cured by even more devolution of power to the local communities ? Lohia asked. He suggested that local corruption was allowed because people knew that local governments counted for very little. "Give the villages and countries large constitutional powers, and let us see if the people don't do something different. It's worth the experiment. Somehow we must overcome these monstrous evils of centralization."

Before the group broke up, someone, worried by the war, but seeing no alternative to rearmament, asked Myles what he would do. For a few minutes Myles was really afire as he talked of his faith that democracy could be applied in the world, positively, before things came to war, in such a way that Communism would be stopped in its tracks. "Why, for the cost of one bomber I would build 3000 tractors. Just give me those 3000 tractors, and I'll invade Asia for peace, and I'll make friends—and do more good than that bomber could ever do."

Myles had yet to hear of Lohia's doubts about large-scale teehnology in Asia. Lohia would probably prefer the Work Camp's coming to India than an invasion of 3000 tractors—but the image was suggestive of a 'vital' spirit at work in the Tennessee hills; anyway, colorful enough to sleep on.

July 19, 1951. Lohia's talk at Howard University, Main Negro College : That evening Lohia was to speak at Howard University, the main Negro college, and the only university established and financed by the U.S. government, President Modecai Johnson, who has been in India, was deeply affacted by Gandhi, and revers Nehru above all other statesmen, gave a dinner beforehand. Perhaps the latter fact, or the fact that both men had been travelling steadily for a month and were tired, interfered with good communication Dr. Johnson's speech to the 1950 C.I.O. Convention, which Lohia had read, reads like that of a prophet out of the Old Testament; with Biblical passion, it points to world equality as the only path by which America can seek salvation. At dinner, however, the main question under discussion was the extent

of Roman Catholic power in the U.S.A.

Lohia's talk that evening reached none of the high points of most of his meetings. After twenty-four hours in this serious-minded worried capital of the West, he may have felt a little frivolous; in any case he rambled informally, to the disappointment of some of his listeners. As usual, of course, his warm personality won him friends, as his complete and cryptic opposition to Nehru antagonized others, especially those from the Indian Embassy. Also, his main points were hard to shallow for any comfortable audience.

He spoke against caste inside a country, and internationally, where a few Brahmin powers, armed with a U.N. veto and vast economic power, dominate the fifty-odd low caste nations. As a field for action against the world caste system he placed before the Americans, especially the Negroes, "the idea of a free and united Africa." "a concept with which we should all become seized."

Then he suggested civil disobedienee as the proper weapon with which to destroy the barrriers that separate people.

> I believe that civil disobedience is a weapon of universal application. And I am not being oblique—I mean it can be used on the race question in this country. If I were an American, I would explore civil disobedience, by Negroes and Whites. I would do it more for the health of the non-Negro than of the Negro. I know that the Negro is a minority, but I believe that if there is an action with courage, there will be a reponse from other sections of the people, and the minority can be transformed into a majority. In any case, to the destruction of the caste system in all its forms we must dedicate our lives.

When asked what the Socialist Party would have done in foreign policy that Nehru has not done, Lohia replied, a little angrily : "If the Socialist Party became the Government of India—if it had been the Government during these three years—the movement for a free and united Africa would be something to count in this world."

> We would not wait until the crisis matures and then deliver judgment and try to mediate, because that means a situation in which we are powerless to act. Look at Indo-China, where

there is no third choice, no alternative to the forces of Communism and Atlantic colonialism, what can be done there now ? But look at Africa, waiting—will we wait until the situation there, too, deteriorates into a struggle between the two camps, or will we who want peaceful change move ahead with bold programmes there before the crisis matures ?
The Socialist Party would have called the nations together to plan a World Development Corporation through which resources could be pooled for economic development. We would try to bring together those who wish to create with those who wish to preserve, for working out that problem separately neither can succeed.

Afterwards someone joked that Lohia might deteriorate, too, once he got in power. Seriously, Lohia replied that was why he hoped he would never be in office. "I wish a tribe of politicians arose all over the world, which would specialize in doing its job without holding offices. A big problem for mankind today is how to tame power. Perhaps one way to do that is by voluntary abdication of power. At least we should give that a try."

Several pacifists questioned Lohia, only to find that he had little hope for applying non-violence to the problem of wars between nations. At least he urged that they first practise it successfully where it was clearly relevant—on domestic injustices inside one country. Yet he was struck by their proposal for a non-violent corps of volunteers who would place themselves between warring, or threatening armies, and give their lives to gain peace. Several times thereafter on the trip this proposal was presented to him. Each time he answered essentially the same, that by all means experiments should be made to apply non-violent direct action to the world scene, that he was sure the time was due for world actions, yet such a frontal assault on armed forces seemed to him not a relevant proposal. Political "relevancy" is one of Lohia's constant themes; too often he found American would-be radicals "irrelevant" in the current scene.

One young Negro came up to say that he was ready for civil disobedience and wanted Lohia to prescribe for him the kind of preparations necessary, in terms of self-discipline and 'purification.' "Evidently he had been reading Gandhi," Lohia said. "I told him not to worry about preparations, just to go ahead and do the best he could. A very fine boy."

36

LOHIA

CLOVIS MAKSUD

Rammanohar Lohia is a name that evokes in me the deepest of emotions and the most articulate of thoughts. In a way this was, I think, his impact on all those who were, in one way or another, associated with him. He was always keen that his politics should pave the way to commitment. Hence there was no room for manoeuvre—or for that matter manipulation. In a complex society like that of India, it was always difficult to determine national priorities. To him they were clear and any failure or reluctance to discern them in the manner he did made him visibly and obviously angry. He was thus a rebel par excellence.

Lohia was intent on sharpening controversy because that brought closer to the minds of the people the issues in which they were involved and rendered it imperative that they answer the questions which the challenges of our times posed. To him unanswered questions were at the roots of overall underdevelopment. So when he undertook to answer the many questions as day arose he in turn was raising new questions. He was impatient with those reluctant to answer, or who sought time to answer. At moments it appeared that Lohia was more eager to have answer postulated than have them adequately conceived. This was the reason why, on many occasions, he was misunderstood and why his pressure for commitment was deemed to be 'obsessive and exclusively oppositional'.

Yet Lohia's very intensity—personally and leadershipwise—

insured that no mediocrity will be given a chance to become institutional. He was intolerant towards mediocrity and hypocrisy—not because he was eager to attack, but because he had immense faith in the human potential. It is this faith that kept him going. He was always worried that the socialists should not achieve too much power too soon lest they lose the purpose of power. He was weary almost allergic to power—as purpose and that is why he kept socialism in India at many crucial moments outside the frame of consequential performance. Herein lies perhaps the essence of Lohia's strength and weakness. He sought to discipline socialist thought and behaviour to an extent whereby it kept other socialists on the spot, on the defensive, giving them a feeling of insufficiency, incompleteness and inadequacy. That was good because it acted as a stimulant and as a corrective. It also helped to prevent socialist thinking and action from being bureaucratized or divested of its revolutionary content. On the other hand, however, he at times became so engrossed with this ennobling task that he tended to become sufficiently self-righteous to insulate his leadership, and his party and disable it from the full communion and influence it was capable of.

The lacuna in Lohia's historic role was that he felt surreptitiously that there was something basically indecent about power. It is here that in many of our conversations, friendly, heated affectionate and injurious, that we had our differences. Lohia, in retrospect, could not distinguish between power as a purpose and power for a purpose. This explains his pessimism in many ways because at times many who worked to achieve power *for* a purpose degenerated into exercising power as a purpose. This was the cause of his disillusionment He saw this process everywhere. At times he saw more than actually was. But he felt that this process was corroding the party in power, the parties in opposition and even the party which he was leading. At this crucial moment Lohia sought to moralize instead of applying his immense talents, his exceptional gifts of coming to grips with the realities that obtained and redirect—or at least help redirect—the process towards the viable equation of power for a purpose

Lohia will now think that I am taking advantage of his physical absence to have some sort of a last word on our continuous debate. I won't because in retrospect, whether I look at my own Arab nation or at the developments in India and in the

third world in general, I find that his formulations whatever they might have lacked in fact were more than adequately compensated in health and relevance. So, there won't be any last word in the debate. Lohia might have posed more questions than he answered but what he has done is that he ascertained that the quest should never cease. This is where he can be counted among the greats.

Yet come to think of it how can we, so early in the wake of his cruel absence make an assessment. Is it not he—Rammanohar Lohia—who, when I was first introduced to him by my friend Harris Wolford in June 1951 gave us an insighted view of the Third Force ? Is it not him who in the U.S.—where I was studying Law—at the height of the anti-communist hysteria forced through the intellectual throat of his American audiences—typical of him—the vision of the convergence and the end of degree postures. Is it not Rammanohar Lohia as when he stayed with me in Lebanon in July and was able to discern the grave dangers that are constituted to the very basic principles all socialism stood for at a time when mases called socialists were vying to place. In Zionists because of their captivity to the terms of reference their eagerness and 'enslaved' to their dilettantes of the "Socialist International", Yes it was Lohia who was visionary to the core and a most autheatic human being.

A final personal note : It painted my end—the sad equation that existed between Nehru and Lohia while I was stationed in India between 1961-66. I feel very strongly that dimension of bitterness in that equation was without damaging consequences to the cover socialism in India. I might be venturing in sweeping a judgement—and I know, not to liking of some—but I strongly feel and I am to be permitted to urge that India will be better off if what Nehru did can be continued by what Lohia thought. Hence the *coalition* of the socialists and not the *coalition* socialists with others. Yet this is not the place for any elaboration. Lohia was a friend of warmth that I make the suggestion because he still lives amongst us—and I hope only that he will allow me and permit the suggestion to be studied.

Many of us who have known Lohia clearly and intimately cannot reconcile to his absence. That is why he will remain part of in-check on our proclivities to indolence and the temptations to deflect. It has enriched our life to have known him so closely and an proud that he considered me a friend.

37

NON-CONGRESSISM AND THE STRATEGY OF REVOLUTION

PARIMAL KUMAR DAS

Political life in India has never been so deceitful, stale and purposeless as it has been since the split in the Congress. The split in the Congress could have heralded the process of change in the body politic of India, if the lessons of non-Congressism had been correctly learnt by those who spearheaded anti-Congress movement in the country. But like the 'salt losing its saltness', the SSP itself began to drag cold feet at a time when the final blow should have been struck against the enemy. On the contrary, pronouncements were made describing non-Congressism "irrelevant". There were other enlightened souls beginning to hear the voices of the 'dumb doll' ! Then starts a period of functioning with two minds and contray purposes, making the party, (which was supposed to be an instrument of change) a laughing stock, Sonepur notwithstanding. The leaders proved to be less than equal to the challange facing the country since July 1969. Among the various political forces in the country, there seems to be a tacit agreement not to disturb the *status quo*. In another context, though equally relevant to the present situation, Lohia gave the reasons why politics in India fails to take up the challenge whenever it presents itself. He said, "The difficulty lies elsewhere. All political parties are run by a high caste leadership. . . . The woes of the dying are not emotionally communicated to the leadership of the government or opposition."[1] Those who still want to pursue, (either in the SSP or outside),

'politics' of change as distinct from 'politics of convenience' (in which most of the political leaders of India are quite adept) would care to remember what Lohia thought of the present day Indian society and government. Lohia believed, "Indian society has lost all sense, all right to exist. Injustice and irrationality are at the bottom of it everywhere. . . . So long as a new society is not firmly laid on basis of justice and rationality, eruptions are bound to take place. The Congress Party has no remedies left. It is totally incapable of any new prescriptions or policies. It has no foreign lands. World public opinion was created in favour of the Indian freedom struggle. The Foreign Department established relations with twelve countries and made their organisations responsive towards the problems of India.

In December, 1936 the annual-session of the Congress was held at Faizpur. Lohia presented a detailed report of the achievements of the Foreign Department before the delegates. By seeing the report, it became obvious that the Foreign Department was not only properly conducted but it also achieved some success. Lohia in his report emphasized that the foreign policy of India should be separate from the British foreign policy, because the latter also stood for the interests of Great Britain. He requested Congress-delegates to chalk out a detailed foreign policy for free India. He suggested in the report that trade relations and tax-policies should be such that the maximum interests of India rather than England should be safe guarded. We should declare that the Indian Army had no support of Indians and we must make relations with other countries in the political and cultural fields.

Thus, the Congress started to take interest in the international problems. 'Palestine Day', Zanzibar Day', 'Abyssinia Day', and 'Andaman Day' were celebrated. Many proposals were passed agsinst the Japanese attack on Manchuria and Italian attack on Abyssinia.

In the Faizpur annual session of the Congress, Jawaharlal Nehru was again elected the president of the Congress. He made no change in the foreign Department. Lohia remained the Secretary of the Foreign Department. There was much talk about the Indian National Movement in foreign countries. On the 7th April, 1937, one of the newspapers of Palestine wrote a letter to Lohia, mentioning "we are wathcing the Indian National

Movement very cautiously. We get little information from the newspapers. The news which you have supplied is very important. Arab-newspapers have published your message and Syria-Baghbad will also publish it."

The Indian National Movement was gathering momentum around the ideals of freedom, socialism and democracy. The fire of the national-movement was burning. It aspired to send the flames to the international sky. The Foreign Department of the All-India Congress declared, "Indians keeping themselves aloof from the British foreign policy, must actively support those countries which are struggling for freedom and democracy. The Italian rape of Abyssinia was denounced. Japanese attack on the Manchuria was vehemently opposed. The Congresss passed a resolution—The Congress Committee is anxious over the Japanese attack on China. And it is aware of the terror created by cruel treatment and bombing over the citizens. In spite of tremendous difficulties and diffierences, the Chinese people are bravely struggling for the protection of freedom and unity. They deserve appreciation for this heroic struggle. The Congress Committee congratulates on the internal unity. At the time of national crisis, the Congress Committee expresses cordial sympathy to the Chinese people and assures full support of Indians in their freedom-struggle. The Committee makes an appeal to all Indians not to use any Japanese goods. This will be a humble symbol of sympathy to the Chinese people.

As a result, meetings were held all over India. Men, money and materials were sent to China. It was proved that the Congress had its own foreign policy. It was no more slave of the British Foreign Policy. Medical mission was also sent to China. It was declared that Indians must support China and Spain which are fighting for freedom. We must not involve in the war affairs of the imperialist-countries like England, France and Germany.

On the 27th September, 1937, Lohia presented a resolution in the meeting called by the Congress Socialist Party at Allahabad. In the resolution, it was said that another World War is being prepared in the interest of Imperialist countries and it will break the economic backbone of the poor countries. Indians will not participate in this war. If at all, the war breaks out, at such a juncture, India will strive for freedom.

By that time Lohia had already formulted a definite foreign

policy of India but the Congress was paying little attention to it. Within the short span of two years, the Foreign Department did a lot of things. With this effect, in February 1938 Haripura—annual session of the Congress, under the Presidentship of Subhas Chandra Bose, not only resolutions on Mauritious, Fiji settled Indians but also on China, Palestine, British Guina and Ceylonese Indians were passed.

The Foreign Department published a weekly bulletin regularly. Lohia commented on international events and gave a new outlook towards the international problems. Under the heading, 'Not Moscow, not Berlin but London', he critcised the British policy. England wanted to balance the fascist and Communist forces. At the same time, she had in mind to suppress the democratic movement. Peace could not be maintained. The Second World War proved the attitude of England. He also criticised Russia. The Government of Russia was becoming more and more dictatorial in nature. Its attitude towards the new civilization became doubtful.

The Foreign Department published so many booklets and articles of Lohia written on the foreign policies of India. Its first publication was the booklet of Lohia. "On the struggle for Civil Liberties". In this booklet, Lohia criticised the policies of England, France and America. "In France, people are born free and equal before Law. But in the courts people are differentiated. It goes against the basic tenets of the French-Revolution, America is becoming a paradise of capitalists. Democratic rights are violated there. Strikes are crushrd by bullets. People are imprisoned in the American colonies, although their demonstrations are peaceful. Fundamental rights of the English people are in danger. Civic-liberty in America is affected by laws whereas in England it is affected by the administration."

Indian Foreign Policy, China and India, Loot of the Foreign Contractors. The salary of the Government officers, these booklets of Lohia were also published by the Foreign Department.

The Foreign Policies of the Indian National Congress and the British Labour Party, a brochure written by Lohia, with the foreword of Jawaharlal Nehru, published by the All-India Congress Committee, laid cown the foundation of the Indian foreign policy in which Lohia criticised the Labour Party's polices and made clear the policies of the Indian National Congress. Firstly, the Indian

National Congress would not support Great Britain on the heavy expenditure on defence because the Indian Army was not indigent.

Secondly, Great Britain believed in armament race and she did not support the principle of an Assembly of Equal Nations.

Thirdly, she also believed in the policies of racialism imperialism and capitalism.

In the year 1936, Lohia pointed out that Congress had two aims :

(i) complete independence of India, and
(ii) resistance to Britain's war. He also suggested the withdrawal of India from the ineffective League of Nations, because she was an additional voice and vote for the British Foreign office. The people of India had no say in the matter and the so-called representatives were nominated by the British Government.

Lohia outlined the broad outlines of the Congress foreign policy as :

(1) India is determined to participate in world affairs as a free and foreign nation. The Congress creed of complete independence and the resolve to frame India's constitution through a Constitution Assembly are evidence of this.
(2) So long as British Imperialism lasts in this country, India is determined to resist by country-wide direct action any attempts force her into Britain's war. It must therefore be clearly understood by the whole world that, for purposes of international diplomacy and war, India does not form part of the British Empire.
(3) India desires the transformation of the League of Nations into a League of Peoples and supports it.
(4) India does not recognise the sanctity of international treaty but declares that aggression can be easily named.
(5) India offers her support to all the national, democratic and socialist forces in the world that are working for peace, freedom and democracy and puts on record her readiness to associate which heartedly in any scheme of

international economic sanctions against an aggressor.

(6) India regards the present Indian army as an army of occupation and cannot in any way support its maintenance or strengthening. The Congress declares that the only way to meet imperialists attacks from without is arms to the people and adult military training. (Form *Foreign Policy* by Lohia, Allahabad, P.C. Dwadar Shreni and Co. (P.) Ltd., 1963, p. 13).

Another brochure *Indians in Foreign Lands* of Lohia was published by the Foreign Department. It deals with the social economic and political problems of Indians settled in Zanzibar Tanganyika, Mauritious, Kenya, British East Africa, South Africa, Malaya, British Guina, Ceylon, China and Japan. Under the heading 'Imperialist New Economic Policy', Lohia has pointed out the exploitation by the British Empire of these colonies. He had also mentioned and criticised the United States for adopting the attitude of the non-eligibility of Indians for naturalisation as United States citizens. An Indian Political Conference was held in London in the month of July 1936 in which certain policies were formulated regarding the colonial states. Lohia has depicted the wretched conditions of Indians in the foreign lands. Indians in large number have been settled in foreign lands. In the words of Lohia, "though spreed all over the world, the essential concentration of Indian populations overseas have been effected on a belt which runs around the Equator from the North Atlantic over the Indian ocean to the South America and the neighbouring island to Trinidad contain Indian communities which are nearly one half of their entire population. The entire South and East of Africa are dotted over by considerable Indian populations. In the three islands of the Indian ocean, Zanzibar, Mauritious and Ceylon, Indians constitute any where between one-tenth and three-fourths of their respective populations. Situated between the Bay of Bengal and the China Sea, they account for nearly one seventh of the population of Malaya. The Equatorial life-line of the British Empire is effectively intersected with vast Indian concentrations."

India's stand by Lohia was issued by the All-India Congress Committee, Allahabad. It contains hardly sixteen pages. This book-deals with the freedom of India. Lohia emphatically

has narrated that India must regain her freedom with the help of Satyagraha.

Indian on China another brochure by Lohia, with foreword of Jawarlal Nehru, was published by J.B. Kripalani, General Secretary, All-Indian Congress Committee, Allahabad in 1938.

Thus, brochures, and booklets by Lohia still bear witnesses to the progress made by the Foreign Department under him within short span of eighteen months.

In the meantime, the session of the Congress Socialist Party was held in Lahore, 1938. Lohia was elected the member of the National Executive of the Congress Socialist Party. At the same time, the Congress made a new rule that the member of the National Executive of the Congress Socialist Party could not be the Secretary of the department office of the All-India Congress Committee. As a result of this, Lohia resigned from the post of Secretary of the Foreign Department of the All-India Congress Committee, in the month of August 1938.

38

DR. LOHIA : ANGREZI HATAO

TULSI BODA

One of the assurances given to the Indian people during the struggle for Indepenadnce was that the national language Hindi and other regional languages will replace English in all spheres of public life. Unfortunately this was forgotten, and free India's Constitution assured the continuation of English for all official purposes for 15 years, during which period Hindi in Devnagari script and the Indian numerals in the international form would assume its place as the official language of the Indian Union. This was the beginning of the reversal of the country's language policy. What was considered to be an interm arrangement for 15 years is now seeking to become the long-term policy under the Official Languages Act of 1963 and the subsequent Amendment Act of 1967.

Thus, while the dominance of the English language continues to get official patronage on the one hand, there has been a systematic campaign in favour of retaining English for all official and public purposes, as the only rich language which is the fountainhead of all knowledge, research and progress, on the other. While the ruling party and the Government spokesmen have been systematically carrying on this campaign, all other Opposition parties, except the Socialist Party, have assumed junior partnership in forcing the people to retain the English language as the medium of administration and education.

Noting the intentions of the Government, Dr. Rammanohar

Lohia, the Socialist Party leader, intiated measures to combat this tendency as early as in 1952.

To Dr. Lohia, freedom, democracy and socialism were not mere slogans for vote-catching. He always insisted that these words had concrete and time-bound meaning and content. As in the other spheres of socialist thought and policies, so on the language issue, Dr. Lohia formulated concretised programmes for the Socialist Party.

SPREADING OF TRUTH

While intiating the "Angrezi Hatao Andolan," he said : "This movement should be based on research and spread of truth. The spreading of truth and facts is the basic need of modern life. But unfortunately truth has become dumb and falsehood talkative, in our times. Due to the stranglehold of the mass media of propaganda by the Government, big business and newspaper barons, truth and facts have been buried. To come out of this suffocating situation on the language issue, 'Angrazi Hatao Andolan' is a step in the right direction."

Dr. Lohia vehemently opposed the Government policy of retaining English while Hindi and other Indian languages developed. He insisted that destruction and creation are mutually complementary. So, the solution of the language problem lay in banishing English and bringing in the Indian languages simultaneously. The country cannot retain English and expect it to be replaced by the Indian languages gradually.

Banishing the use of English as the State language was, according to Dr. Lohia, one of the basic prerequisites for a healthy growth of democracy and for reducing socio-economic inequalities. So long as Ministers, Government officers and top political leaders emerge only out of the one per cent population which knows English, the problems of hunger, unemployment, social inequality, etc., will continue to harass the 99 per cent of the population which does not know English. In his characteristic way, Dr. Lohia said the campaign against English was in essence the campaign for improving the lot of 27 crores of our countrymen, who hardly earn 19 paise per day. Unless English was removed and the administration and education conducted in Indian languages, the Prime Minister of the country will continue to

spend Rs. 25,000.

English, as the medium of administration and education, has resulted in a situation where in the Army. Navy and the Air-force, All posts of Lieutenant Colonel and above will necessarily be manned by English-knowing persons, and patriotism, bravery, leadership qualities, logistical expertise, etc, will not necessarily be qualifications required for such posts.

Under the dominance of English the industrial development and distribution channels will necessarily be oriented to the needs and happiness of the one per cent English-knowing population. No wonder that the production of air-conditioners, motor cars, electric lifts for posh multi-storeyed residential buildings, etc., has shown remarkable progress in the first 25 years of freedom; whereas the production of essential asticles of consumption like cloth yarn, sugar and bicycles, etc., has registered decline.

So long as English dominates, the labour movement in the country will be manned by English-knowing persons, because everything connected with the labour movement is in English. A Prabhakar More will not be able to lead the Hind Mazdoor Panchayat, nor will a Gulabrao Ganacharya head the AITUC.

Dr. Lohia and once pointed out that the Union Law Minister, the Chief Justice of India and the Chief Election Commissioner were all related to each other. Similarly, the Foreign Minister, the Indian High Commissioner in England and the Principal Advisor to the Government of India on China were closa relations. He said even if all these gentlemen were appointed on their individual merits, it was but human and inevitable that knowingly or unknowingly they would conceal and protect in a nutural manner the mistakes committed by any one of them. Such a situation would be conducive to corrupt practices, and can never further the interests of the nation.

STATE OF SECRECY

The recruitment for the top posts from among about 50 lakhs of people knowing English breeds a state of secrecy between them and the 99 per cent of the population not knowing English. This would not ensure the defence of our freedom and democratic values, nor would it sustain progressive and socialist movements. Hence Dr. Lohia laid great stress on organising the "Angrezi

Hatao" movement. Will this movement continue after his death ? The present Socialist Party tries to provide an answer.

The draft policy platform of the Socialist Party contains the elaboration of the Party's language policy. The brief document adopted by the former SSP and PSP at the time of the merger of the two parties also contains the basis of the merged parties' language policy. Such a language policy envisages the replacement of English by people's languages in the country's administration, law courts, legislatures, educational institutions, research and universities. The medium of public service examinations shall be the Indian languages in place of English.

SOCIALIST COMMITMENT

However the correct answer to the problem will depend upon the commitment with which this language policy will be accepted by the leadership and members of the Socialist Party. In concrete terms, the Party will have to create public opinion and agitate for :

1. Use of Hindi and Indian languages as medium or administration and education. English may be taught as an optional language like French, Russian, etc.
2. The proceedings of Parliament, Assemblies, etc., must be conducted in Hindi or any one of the Indian languages.
3. Public Service Commission examinations must be in Hindi or any other Indian language.
4. English should not be used for public purposes.

If the Socialist Party is sincere about this policy, its members without any exception, should abide by this policy only. The deliberations at the all-India conference of the Socialist Party will provide the real answer to the question : Will the "Angrazi Hatao" continue to have any relevance to the socialist movement ?

39

LOHIA IN THE LOK SABHA

H.V. KAMATH*

Dr. Rammanohar Lohia ought to have been elected to the Lok Sabha years earlier; as a matter of fact he should have joined the Canstituent Assembly in the late forties where with his buoyancy, rather flamboynce and wordy missiles, he would have helped to create a milieu after my own heart. Dr. Ambedkar would probably have put him at the head of the rebel members of that august body—a place which he assigned to me in the course of his valedictory speech in November 1949. The Congress Socialist Party's decision to boycott the Assembly was a wrong and short-sighted one, as Shri Asoka Mehta confessed to me in 1948. The Forward Bloc did not come very much in my way.

So, in the early sixties, via a by-election in Uttar Pradesh, Dr. Lohia made his debut in the Lok Sabha. The Opposition was, I believe, far more effective in that third Lok Sabha, than before or after, despite its strenght of only about 140 in a House of over 520. That quinquennium saw three Prime Ministers and two wars. My friend Lohia made an impact with his maiden speech itself in May 1963, which with its hard statistics and pungent style, nonplussed Nehru who got himself tied into knots from which he found it difficult to extricate himself. I think Lohia's attitude to Shri Lal Bahadur Shastri was a bit softer, largely because of the latter's genuine humility and sincerity.

*Formely Member Parliament.

When however, Smt. Indira Gandhi became Prime Minister in January 1966, he returned to his old form characterised by militancy and ruthlessness towards the Government, a strategy with which I with my mantra of "expose, oppose and depose" entirely agreed.

BLIND SPOT IN HIS MAKE-UP

One issue, however, divided him and me, the question of language in Parliament. It was a blind spot in his make-up. I discussed this matter with him at length twice, once in my room in Constitution House and again in the lobby of the Lok Sabha. Neither of us could convince the other. I remarked that Parliament was not a school for languages, but our conutry's highest forum where the nation's problems had to be debated and resolved. As such, every member should be free to express himself in a language in which he is proficient and which is understood by the majority of, it not all, other members. This was my reply to his suggestion that I should speak in my mother-tongue, Konkani, or in Kannada, if I was not at home with Hindi which, he was good enough to say, I used deftly in public and party meetings outside, I also added that brevity and precision, particularly when one is racing against time in Parliament, unlike in conclaves outside. demanded the use of a language medium, which one could wield effectively and over which one has better command than over others; and no adulterated language, please, if I could help it. I pleaded earnestly with him that hatred of any language—we fought British imperialism, not their language—is irrational and absurd. I made it clear to him : "I am a linguo-phile, neither a linguo-phobe nor a linguo-maniac," and I did not wish to promote Babelisation in Parliament.

It is unfortunate that after the union of PSP and SP in May 1964 largely in pursuance of his call for unconditional merger, Dr. Rammanohar Lohia kept aloof from the new SSP, and in Parliament not only did he not help cement the bonds between the former PSP and SP members, but his method of working, I am sorry to say, tended to alienate them gradually from each other. This was undoubtedly one of the factors which led to the break-up in January 1965. His egocentrism, bordering on megalomania, made it well-nigh impossible for persons of comparable calibre and

integrity to work with him smoothly and harmoniously.

Even so, he was a talented man and a dauntless fighter. His untimely death, at the age of 57 has robbed India's public life of not a little courage and colour. I had seen him during his last illness in hospital, and I have reason to believe that medical negligence and inattention was partly responsible for has death. Had he been with us today he would have stoked the fires of Opposition with energy and zeal.

40

LOHIA AND THE INDIAN YOUTH

[illegible] MOHAN TOOFAN

When Rammanohar Lohia was a young man of considerable sensitivity, Gandhi was the leading light of India. In the post-freedom days when the Mahatma was no more on the scene, Dr. Lohia, through still in his late thirties, was the leader for the young political activists. Yes, yes, there was J.P. and a galaxy of stars and yet Dr. Lohia, with his enthusiasm and passion for the causes left unfinished by the Congress leaders, attached the youth which stood in urgent need of a leader with some charismatic touch. The youth movement was still in its infancy and hardly knew any positive direction.

A decade passed. J.P. had left the platform and the indispens-ability of Lohia became more vivid and obvious. A new generation under 25 years of age had come up with [illegible] problems staring directly into their faces. The [illegible] stereotyped politics launched by the Congress elders that [illegible] completely eroded and in its place despairing and nihilist tendencies on the campuses had started growing [illegible].

The youth [illegible] now had ventured into politics [illegible] sporadically. They had conquered no position because they had no ideas, and abstractions of socialism could hardly [illegible] by them.

SPONTANEOUS RESPONSE

Lohia defreezed the situation [illegible]

own ideals had become transpersonal by now and he needed a horde of committed militants. It was no easy job as psofessional pessimists and cynics had also grown in large numbers and the country was fast going down the hill. The political experience which Lohia had accumulated urged him to offer for the first time a dynamic and different political programme which could sustain the endeavours of the youth. Lohia's personal warmth and his passionately formulated work schedules won spontaneous response from the youth. The young idealists in their teens and, of course, "seasoned vagabonds" rushed forward and responded to a man whom they now called Doctor Sahib. A whole new youth movement grew out of Lohia's deeply felt convictions.

The Indian youth which never had the taste of a clear-cut programme before needed a leader for all seasons and Lohia did not fail them. The despair gradually vanished and nihilism was replaced by articulation; in fact Lohia provided voice to the despair of the youth. The Indian youth movement was then divided in various streamlets and was controlled and coloured by different ideologies. The communal and the communist youth, after hanging their heads against the Nehru wall and hardly attaining any noteworthy victory, had visualised many disappointments lying ahead. Their leadership, devoid of all ideas, had stuck in isolation due to their eternal hang-over after every General Election. Lohia, who was no prisoner of fake ideological stances and who had now understood the hollowless of the party in power, threw his net of fundamental human values in the vast ocean of Indian unrest and, who, the young men thronged in thousands to swear by him. The Indian youth movement started taking a new turn, this time more purposeful, more angry and more unconventional, The establishment shuddered for the first time and for the first time the communalists and the communists envied Dr. Lohia.

The communalists and the communists, who had for so long tried to make the youth of India believe that the field of active politics was divided only into two competitive but similarly structured groups, soon found Lohia turning the tables on them. Lohia has provided the youth movement third choice in which both the liberal and the radical could find their place. The youth had now the chance to learn a new meaning of democracy, of course, different from the prevalent one. Lohia converted the bulk

of the youth to turn against authoritarianism of all colours and hues. It was no small matter that Lohia, now the most talked about man in India, released the youth from outdated ideological disciplines and egged them on to rely on fresh thinking.

ANGER UNBOUND

Lohia was a full-time changer and he desired he youth to do the same and therefore he realised the importance of time. Only those having ample free time and leisure at their hands became his handpicked militants whom he trained in his style for the game of politics. The Yogi and the Commissior had no use for Lohia. By preaching his ideological goals to a mass of youthful activists Lohia turned their minds against all Meccas and prophets. His theme was anger and the socialist youth movement became an army of angry young men. Uncommon anger aginst common injustices and visible tyranny of society became the hallmark of his young admirers. The youth movement in the campuses and outside thrived on this display of anger; anger against Nehru's aristocratic postures, anger against the social tyranny of the high castes and anger against the supremacy of the English language. Anger was unbound and yet Lohia was not entirely satisfied with the manning of the youth movement.

The youth in other political groups was busy in either ringing door bells in the early hours of the day or theorising the ready-cooked documents provided by the temples at Moscow or Peking. They were aspirants for a political career with an eye on tangible returns. The party in power was at the same offering patronage and graft to the youth. Lohia was not in a position to offer anything except more anger. The question of expectations of any material pay-off did not arise. And yet the movement had to be fed and organised. The young invaded the citadels of sophistication and lived frugally in a world of their own. Unlike other youth factions. the Lohia youth was under no restraint of any kind. An iconoclast being their leader, many of them shipped their classes and tore down the mansion lived in by the smug professorship.

Big issues were at stake in the country. Nehru was dead. India was facing humiliation and drought, and corruption was rampant. Lohia was on top of the wave of unrest. He needed crusaders with a clear perception of the world around them. The

cruel joke of the Government was an offer of glib talk on poverty which appeared outrageous to the youth. Lohia had by now appeared in the process of changing the political life of the country with his new call for non-Congressism. He was willing to take risks. The youth was also by now ready to attack the political bastion of the Congress Party. It was no flash in the pan as there was enough coherence and programme behind the new thrust of the youth. The elections had taken over the scene, the youth responded, their amateurish qualities provided quite some fun and when the die was cast, the Congress Party fell in ten States. But this was Lohia's victory and not that of youth.

AGAIN, WITHOUT LOHIA

The youth still was not properly organised and had hardly any intellectual capacity to affect political institutions. Their enthusiasm could win the day for Lohia but they could not be good party faithful. Lack of training in the organisational work and their incapacity to comprehend the mind of Lohia soon made them to face the hang-over after the elections. They did not comprehend the coalition politics; perhaps the youth movement built by Lohia was outpolled at the first primary. What else could Lohia do for them? The attitudes prepared to snatch power proved ineffective in handling the power.

The youth movement was partly in the cities and though it was partly sub-ordinate to Lohia's political party, it was far from the understanding he wanted to create in them. Political deals and compromises inherent in every political move were too big a dose for them and that too in such a short time. They could not resolve even the problem of force. The raw recruit unlike the Cuban youth didn't learn while they fought. Their militant activities lacked initiative and ingenuity. Blinded by Dr. Lohia's spectacular rise, the youth lost sight of simple facts—the need of a disciplined organisation. It could not be up to the Master to spoonfeed every one of them, they had to evolve the method to achive their own emancipuation through a thoroughly well oiled machinery.

The youth movement from 1957-67 was given a clear direction and yet their adolescent courage and romanticism could not convince them that any revolution in India would always start

from below and that too brick by brick. The tragedy of Lohia's passing away soon after his riding the wave left the socialist youth movement utterly fragmented. What a sad experience for all those who looked forward to something fresh, something vital and something mystic ! Perhaps the socialist youth will try once again to reorganise their ranks but now they have to do without any Dr. Lohia much less without his semblance.

41

MARX AND LOHIA : THE SOCIALIST PATH

JAGDISH JOSHI

The study of Dr. Lohia and his philosophy cannot be from one angle. If so, the study will not be complete and there is every likelihood of misunderstanding him. Outwardly Dr. Lohia appeared rigid and uncompromising but in the field of knowledge, study and science he was most flexible and prepared to discuss any matter in all its aspects. As a scientific thinker he had a perfect reasoning, on which he based his deductions.

Amongst all the philosophers and interpreters of socialism, only two will stand the test of time and history, Karl Marx and Lohia, one occidental and the other oriental, the one belonging to the tribe of the conquerors, the Europeans, the other from the coloured world, the most exploited part of the earth. There is a clear distinction in their approach basically because of historical and geographical conditions of the areas from where these two great apostles came. The doings of Lenin differed very much from the sayings of Marx even in basically European atmosphere, because geographical and historical circumstances had changed there. How can one expect the gospel of Marx to apply in the vastly different conditions of starving, exploited Asia ?

The student of socialism must be alert in examining objective situations instead of historically applying a formula which may not suit the area where he wants to implement it. The law of situations and historical conditions need be examined in the broader canvass of humanity. Hence a clear examination of truth is essential in

introducing a philosophy for mankind.

THEORY OF SUPREMACY

Lohia starts his book *Marx, Gandhi and Socialism* thus: "Truth is known from an aspect or angle. That is to say that truth is partial. In fact, partial truth is strictly speaking an error of expression. Truth is either whole or not at all. . . . All truth is discovered from the aspect or the angle which the seeker or the knower adopts."

Hence if we try to apply Marx to the Asian situation we shall stand bewildered. Experiments with certain aspects of European socialism or communism have badly baffled the developing Afro-Asian nations.

Lohia has dealt with Marxism basically as a European doctrine which not only claims superiority but has proved to be powerful weapon of Europe against Asia. "Marxism is not the only doctrine that has sought or maintained Europe's superiority over the coloured peoples. All doctrines emanating in the last three centuries of Europe's domination have done so. Of capitalism or liberalism, no proof is necessary, for their whole career is tied up with oppression and exploitation of Asia and other coloured lands. All doctrines, so it appears, have their being within a certain framework of power. They are unable to burst this framework, not unless they are born outside Adam Smithism, Marxism and other doctrines such as those of Roussean, Locke, and Hegal have each served Europe's spirit and aims." *Marx, Gandhi and Socialism.* page 8).

Of all the European doctrines, Lohia feels that Marxism seeks to cover all humanity and has an attractive face for traditionally down-trodden people but still it goes a long way to establish the superiority of Europe over the coloured people. "Unfortunately, however, liberated forces of production behave in Asia differently from Europe. . . Even assuming that this technology should grant plenty to coloured regions in however distant future, the theoretical prospect is one of greater plenty to the whites and Marxism has not been aware of this problem." (*Marx, Gandhi and Socialism,* page 9).

DOCTRINAL INSANITY

This is not a mere saying or an analysis. The crux of the Sino-Soviet conflict lies in the very root Marxism. The alleged Cultural Revolution of China and its border conflict with Russia were not so much a part of the war of succession nor an attempt to purify the order but it was born out of the insanity of a doctrine. Lohia has concretised this theory in his two leading articles in *Mankind.*

"Soviet China and Soviet Russia had both destroyed capitalism and established Marxism, so thought the Chinese. They should, therefore, have been able to achieve equality, at least between two of them. This did not happen. There is no prospect of its happening. . . The Chinese see no prospect of attaining equality with Russians, much less with Americans, at any level, not even at the military level. They are not prepared to examine the doctrinal foundations of why this is so. . . Their faith becomes bitter and fiercer with each successive failure They have failed all along the time from production in steel to production in agriculture, not of course against India, but what is decisive for their doctrine, against Russia and America. . . . Against these material and doctrinal failures the Chinese are raving. They are receiving no ideological or spiritcal assistance from any quarter." (*Mankind,* May 1967, pp. 62-63).

Dealing further with growing insanity of China, Lohia observed :

"With the faith in Marxism on the one hand and this reality of unequal productivity on the other even between the two Marxist countries, anybody would go mad and we are not surprised that China has." (*Mankind,* October 1967, page 48).

But in one of the last editorials of his life, Lohia not only gave a pointer to the developing nations but laid a strong foundation of his philosophy which in the course of time will appear to be the only reasonable and probable basis of equality :

THE LAST TESTAMENT

"Even if this theory of insanity of doctrine does not attract Euro-American attention, we hope the people of India and other similar poor countries will pay it some attention as a possible

explanation of China's conduct. Imperialists, neo-imperialists, colonialists and neo-colonialists, are all baby talk compared to this imperialism of productivity, which is so real that it has driven China into insanity and India into sloth.

"The time has come for peoples of Asia, Africa and South America to think up a doctrine of equality which will not be confined to national frontiers which will at the same time be self-reliant like what China is today, instead of what she was when she got Russian help, and which may hopefully in course of time persuade Euro-American people and their governments to see that armament and poverty are two names of a single disease, The Afro-Asian name is poverty and Euro-American armament. Therefore, dispoverty and disarmament are two names of a single medicine that may repair the health of the world." (*Mankind*, October 1967, page 48).

It would not be unfair to call this medicine the last testament of the Doctor who always fought not only against all odds but all ailments and sufferings of humanity.

Socialism must now find out the details of the last strings left by Lohia. Mad application of Marxist dogmas makes a nation sterile. Experiments of nationalisation in India has given worst results, thereby giving a bad start to socialism in India. Presently officialdom and the Soviet lobby are both advocating heavy industry and nationalisation. In the so-called mixed economy both private and public sectors have badly degenerated copying each other's evils.

Similarly, the theory of class struggle cannot be worked in India without eradication of caste system. History cannot be interpreted merely as Marx did or as S.A. Dange deals with it in his book. Indian history has to be read with the background of the caste system. Different local factors have to be scientifically analysed before applying so foreign a formula as Marxism.

Social and political thinkers of India, with only a few exceptions, have studied this country from a caste Hindu "Dwija" angle and not with a composite picture of India as a whole. Age-old mental reservations have crept even into the realm of new theories. Gandhi and Lohia stand as exceptions. They have taken a composite view.

FAITH OF OUR TIME

Lohia accepts Marx in respect of physical relations of property and agrees with the Upanishads in the matter of desire for property. He says that physical relations of and desire for property both should be adequately regulated. Hence he emphatically declares that the abstract should not be devoid of the concrete, which makes the body and the soul one. Dogmatic barriers could not cloud his mind. Hence, while concluding his Historical chapter, he says with force and heart :

"Soviet Russia has been encouraging leftism from top, perhaps without knowing it. The U.S. has been encouraging effete rightism and corrupt leftism by turns or both at the same time, perhaps without knowing it. A genuine leftism from bottom, unafraid of rousing the people for seven revolutions and aware equality of various international menaces with which it is surrounded, but willing to take help from wherever it comes, is the faith of our time." (*Marx, Gandhi and Socialism*, page 47).

42

GANDHI, LOHIA AND GANDHISM

BIRENDRA KUMAR BHATTACHARYA

"He represents the conscience of the future man"[1] in this one pregnant sentence Dr. Radhakrishnan expresses what can be termed as an enduring bequest of Gandhiji's noble life. "Among the leaders of men, he was the first in world history to be a revolutionary of political and economic structures together with being revolutionary of the inner world and ways of conduct."[2]—remarks Dr. Rammanohar Lohia, the socialist sage of India. I do not know whether the materialists of both the mechanical and the dialectical schools have ever been equipped with the knowledge to probe into the culture of the soul. The rationalists are as onesided as the metaphysicians in their concepts of things and therefore slow to recognise the psychological standpoint. The psychic process operating in an individual like Gandhiji have never been analysed empirically. The symbols, signs and images which he accepted as emanations from the unseen world or Truth,—all are clothed in a familiar pattern of language and ideas of the Indian religious tradition and this has led the environmentalists to reject his religious ideas as anachronistic or reactionary.

Gandhiji's religion did not serve the interests of the priestly class, the communalists and also probably the capitalists and landlords. His religion was a religion of man; it was a mode of identification with mankind whom he claimed to serve. He told Dr. Lohia that a man can not be a Satyagrahi unless he believes in God. His God was indentified with such abstract values as truth,

love, non-violence and justice. But he was not dogmatic and believed that atheists too could be equally good Satyagrahis.[3] His insistence on non-violence and truth as the supreme values of religion and struggle for freedom led him almost to alter the character of both in Indian society. He allowed his thoughts and programmes to be influenced and modified by his honest opponents, and as Dr. Lohia has noted "from his belief that the caste system was a part of religion, he went on to say that it was a sin. From his belief that the sum-total of the British empire tended to act for good he went on to say that it was Satanic, and from a certain underlying belief in the sanctity of private properly. he went on to demand its confiscation without compensation and termination of land ownership."[4]

He was developing his ideas and estimates of men and affairs along with discovery of truths about them. His Good was what Jung would have called an archetype of collective unconscious; Rama was the image of human reconstruction, and the *charkha*, the symbol of economic well-being of the masses. His words were simple and sounded medieval in tone. His living was that of a saint, whose saintliness consisted of austerity in habits, purity in thought, selflessness, in action, indifference to gold and pleasure and unshakable belief in prayer. He believed in the change of heart of the masses as a means of abolition of tyranny, exploitation, greed, fear and minority rule. This method had its own limitations, for besides reason, he had divine sources of justifying his actions. Yet he moulded common men into heroes as few other men in history have done, by examples of personal character and persuasive love. The revolutionary in him always manifested in immediate actions, that was not only the actualisation of the ideal but also the means to effect a desirable social change. The form of his politics was often deceptive, but the contents were always impressive; the secret of his life's success lies in capacity to outweigh the evil by the tremendous power of the good.

Gandhiji has been always looked upon (by the communists) as the "ablest leader of bourgeois nationalism." tolerated by the Indian bourgeoisie for protecting their class interests, and allowed to co-exist with the Marxists solely because of the political immaturity of the proletariat. They have dubbed him as an advocate of social conservatism. Hindu revivalism, idealised, poverty and primitive economy, putting a brake on the

social revolution. R.P. Dutta even went as far as to accuse Gandhiji to be a defender of landlordism. Dutta was a convinced communist having definite ideas of industrialisation, technological and social revolution, and therefore could not foresee the dynamic and evolutionary element in Gandhism. In 1947, Gandhiji wrote thus in Harijan, "It can be asked whether the present Rajas and others can be expected to become trustees of the poor. If they do not become trustees of their own accord, force of circumstances will compel the reform unless they court utter destruction. When Panchayat Raj is established, public opinion will do what violence can never do. The present power of the Zamindars, the capitalists and the Rajas can hold sway only so long as the common people do not realise their own strength. If the people non-co-operate with the evil of Zamindari or capitalism, it must die of inanition. In Panchayat will be obeyed and the Panchayat can only work through the law of their making."[6] Gandhiji was wary of the confiscation of private propety as it was inconsistent with his theory of non-violence and therefore advocated his rather hazy trusteeship theory which envisaged "best use of property for the people by competent hands." But Gandhiji admitted that Trusteeship "as he conceived it, had yet to prove its worth." Dr. Lohia had exchanged ideas with him on the theory of trusteeship and according to the former, Gandhiji's position was something like this. Gandhiji worked on the assumption that man was essentially good and therefore responsive to truth. This belief puts limiitations on the development of his ideas on the abolition of capitalism, but the change of heart thesis did not stand in the way of the idea of peaceful transition of society from private to social ownership.

Gandhiji's understanding of capitalism and communism was blurred by his pre-occupations with non-violence, truth and other abstract concepts that are ingredients of moral civilization. These general aims alwas formed an inalienable part in his political programme and strategy. Gandhiji was general in his concepts. Unlike Adam Smith or Marx, he did not build an elaborate science of economics or social doctrine. Gandhism is a religious doctrine of social ownership, utopian in source. Gandhiji's study of Marxism and his experience of socialist and communist movements led him to modify his views on trusteeship and industrialisation. But his understanding of the Indian conditions was direct, and on the basis of this knowledge he tried to evolve his own economic

ideas centred around *charkha*, electricity, equality, decentralisation and voluntary dimunition of wants. Gandhism thus lacked a strong and revolutionary economic base, a lack which confound his followers, who since his death, gradually moved on to two positions either of opportunist blending of communist doctrine with Gandhian non-violence or of revolutionary change with monastic Gandhism. Both became forces of *status quo* and in practice, the unconscious protectors of the capitalist system.

The Gandhian ideas were never integrated into a comprehensive theory of revolution and Gandhiji, the man and the leader, was the indispensable link amongst them. He had little time to write books. During the period of detention in Aga Khan Palace, he read Das Capital and other communist literature and studied the doctrine of communism in the light of his own ideas. At the end of it writes Pyarelal, he was convinced more than ever that communism of his conception was the only thing that could bring peace to suffering humanity. But in absence of any comprehensive statement about his conception of communism, it is difficult to know whether Gandhiji disapproved the Marxian theory of socialist revolution or not. Evidently he disapproved Marx's force theory of violence. Whether he approved of the parliament as on agency of change, which Engels did, is also not clear, but his technique of Satyagraha did not preclud its use.

Satyagraha, wrote Gandhiji, is a process of educating public opinion, such that it covers all elements of society and in the end makes itself irresistible. Violence interrupts the process and prolongs the real revolution of the whole social structure. The conditions necessary for the success of Satyagraha are : (1) The Satyagrahi should not have hatred in his heart against the opponent; (2) The issue must be true and substantial; (3) The Satyagrahi must be prepared to suffer till the end for his cause. The parliamentarian cannot be an ideal Satyagrahi in the above ideal, yet he can be an imperfect educator of public opinion in favour of change, provided he has the necessary convictions. But Satyagraha of Gandhiji's conception was an alternative to bullet. It includes passive resistance, civil disobedience, and non-violent non-co-operation. Its most modern Indian exponent, Dr. Lohia, has said, "Satyagraha is the specific contribution to political action which Gandhiji made. The way has been opened to the mass of the people, to the individual, to groups of people to violate laws.

I will not go into that rather elementary discussion as to whether Satyagraha is permissabible in a state of freedom, whether it was permissible only when British rule prevailed and all that kind of rather childish prattle. Satyagraha as a weapon will prevail as long as injustice and oppression prevail, and it should prevail; because if it does not, the gun or the bullet will. This is the specific alternative which India in the last thirty years has placed before the world : civil disobedience or bullet ?"[8] This statement may not appear quite Gandhian, if by Gandhian, one means that one should be innocuous and reticent. Lohia's purpose is to salvage Gandhism from its recent distortions and fall, and "embody the essential part of Ghandhiji's teachings in a mechanism of struggle that we might evolve ourselves."

Lohia was a disciple of Gandhiji, but he never accepted the latter's viewpoints blindly and differed from him on many occasions over approach to problems and mode of action. Lohia was once jokingly called Ravana, the learned demon of Ramayana. But Gandhiji said that he possessed continuity of character. Character and knowledge go together and ethics, in an individual, have always to be related to his philosophy of life. Gandhiji had amongst his recruits non-believers, protestants, pleasure-seekers and men of different faiths; all of them shared his faith in man in his own way and it cannot be said that the Ekalabyas were lesser disciples than Arjuns. It is possible for one to be a Satyagrahi even without a belief in god or adherence to external norms of ethical behaviour if he possesses character and self-discipline. This is more necessary because Satyagraha is a weapon of self-suffering, personal courage and deep conviction. It can be used by a single man or an army or volunteers. It fact Gandhiji's greatest contribution to human history is his technique of Satyagraha, the most effective and civilised from of resistance to injustice practised on a mass scale suited to the temper of a democratic age. The atomic age has ushered in a historical situation in which every form of rebellion or movement that used to be based formerly on war or organised violence tends to take a less classical and violent form. The technique of Satyagraha is the product of the same age that produced the deadliest weapon of atom bomb.

In India the communist forces have been increasingly taking to peaceful forms of agitation dictated more by necessity than by convictions. But communism, as a doctrine of primacy of

economic aims is unable to incorporate the general aims envisaged in the Gandhian doctrine. The momentary act in the Gandhian form of peaceful class struggle contains in it the enduring values human culture, compassion, and good conduct. "The good means must not be postponed until after the advent of the revolution and the revolution must not be postponed until all men have become good." The antimonies between the religious and the non-religious, the individual and the social, moment and eternity so long as these operate within categories of inadequate and closed philosophies, they may appear as motive forces for change, but a deep understanding of their nature may lead to a happy resolution of these apparent confrontations in a creative synthesis of materiality and spirituality. Satyagraha is not only religious in the sense of ethics and compassion, but it is also a form of peaceful class struggle in which the soldier has to prepare himself to face the moment of struggle in the right spirt and perspective. The aim of Satyagraha is to produce a non-violent army to resist injustice in whatever form it is found prevalent in the world.

Gandhiji, as a great man of action, had little time for theoretical pre-occupations and yet he has left us enough ideas which can be, under a valid frame of references, fitted into a modern economic and political doctrine. His economic ideas sprang out of his compassion for the poor in India. Gandhiji realised that poverty of the Indian millions cannot be solved either by capitalist of communist industrialisation which would require a huge amount of capital beyond the capacity of the nation.[10] Gandhiji's idea of industrialisation can be gauged from the following remarks made by him on planning, "I heartily endorse the proposition that any plan which exploits raw materials of a country and neglects the potentially more powerful man-power is lop-sided and can never tend to establish human equality. Real planning consists in the best utilisation of the whole man-power of India and distribution of the raw products of India in her numerous villages instead of sending them out-side and rebuying finished articles at fabulous price."[11] Gandhiji's ideas of *charkha* economics and self-sufficient village rule were inspired by a compassionate desire to give employment to millions and make them attain all round equality under a rationalised economic structure based on a decent standard of living. "I have no partiality for return to primitive methods of grinding and husking for the sake

of them. I suggested the return because there is no other way of giving employment to the millions of villagers who are living in idleness,"[12] "Our spinnining propaganda is not based on miserable condition of mill labourers. It is based on the fact that mills cannot give employment to the mass of our starving millions. A net-work of mills, run on howsoever ideal lines, will not solve the problem of poverty."[13] He detested imperalism which was simply the outer cycle of capitalism in production and distribution. He was not opposed to social ownership of the key industries and the land. It would be wrong therefore to suppose that he was a protector and advocate of capitalism or primitive economy. He wanted the productive forces to grow at a rate that was at par or in consonance with the conditions of full employment in the country. Gandhiji intuitively rejected the capitalist and communist ways of development of Indian resources, and was engaged in search of a new economic structure which shall face these problems, and digest them in order that society may be reconstructed.

According to Dr. Lohia's calculation, it would require about 2,000 billion or 1,000 billion rupees of capital investment respectively to industrialise India on the models of America of Russia, and even then this development can be achieved only at a great human cost. At present India is hardly capable of making more than Rs. 150 per capita investment. To achieve the American or Russian standard it might require for India 200 years or so. Even a system of social ownership would not be able to mobilise in the country more than the present estimate of Rs. 10 billion rupees in terms of present prices for the specified period. Even the communist type of political system would have to practise cruelty to the extent of exterminating millions of people if it does not change its traditional technique of industrialisation.[14] Gandhiji's insistence on human value in the context of remoulding Indian economy therefore has to be viewed in its true light. If a plan of industrialisation can be devised that it can facilitate capitalisation on a reasonable level, then a new economic and political structure can be sketched out of the Gandhian ideas. Dr. Lohia deeply went into the problem and ultimately advocated a new pattern of industrialisation on the basis of the four-pillar state and invention of a small-unit technology. The Gandhian revolution cannot be brought about only by the unique method that he showed to us, but also by adopting a new mode of production suited to the

conditions of India and other coloured lands. Indian industrialisation then can be brought about by the aid of an Indian technology, invented by our own engineers and scientists. This is a genuine socialist as well as Gandhian aspiration.

The political life of the country seems to be under severe strains of economic failures and hazards of irritative adventures. As Dr. Lohia pointed out, the Asian politics are today suffering from five malaises : (1) existence and growth of politics based on religion, caste, or race; (2) prevalance of government by repression or terror and opposition politics by armed rebellion or assassination; (3) the rise of a new middle class of bureaucrats and politicians with expensive European habits; (4) the unquestioned leadership of phrase mongers and stage actors whose deeds are negligible; and (5) the absence of a social philosophy and also of comprehensive policies and programmes.[15] The Indian political scene is no different, but Gandhiji's unique contribution of Satyagraha as a method of political struggle and his insistence on liberal nationlism relesed certain forces within Indian society that have been trying to carry on his tasks in a creative manner. As a prophet of liberal nationalism his message still inspires and the nativity of his ideas and actions still stands out distinct from other superimposed varieties of politics in Asia. Both capitalism and communism are trying to win over the soul of Asia and unlike Europe bath the forces are currently not strictly co-existent and peaceful here. But as the struggles in Vietnam and Indonesia have amply proved, the tactics of sectarian revolt and imported civil wars have neither brought political power to the hands of the people, nor resulted in the emergence of a comprehensive programme of social reconstruction. Gandhiji's idea of a new programme of decentralised political and economic structure suited to the lands of teeming population and poor capital resources can still be a basis for Asian socio-economic reconstruction, but in this, India has to show the way. Foreign capital, foreign technology, foreign food and borrowed concepts are the bane of Asian politics today and stand in the way of decentalisation of power and technology. The Gandhian revolution can be simply stated as panchayat plus small unit technology. The anti capitalist forces in Asia and the world today have a distinct chance of taking a Gandhian-oriention, but for that to happen, greater alertness on the part of the Gandhians will be needed for bringing out to the forefront the master's

revolutionary doctrine and comprehensive programme of human reconstruction. In current movements of workers' resisting automation and other forms of rationlisation of technology, there is an unconscious protest of workers against the western form of advanced technology.

Gandhiji's rise is not an accidental or peripheral phenomenon in history. However inadeduate he may appear in his standpoints on philosophy, religion, art, economics and social change, he fulfilled a historical as well as a human role of affirming man's highest values in life, his belief in himself, his deep faith in truth and non-violence as a means of individual and social renewal. Everybody who knew, heard or read about him was profoundly moved by the story of his life and felt him as part of himself. Individuals went to him to find solace, to accuse, to argue, to find fault with him but love ruled their personal relationships. He lived in live contact with men, learning from as well as correcting them. He made a deep impression on history. The essence of his life lay in that peculiar kind of naivety that is characteristic of a saint, and that spirit of action that always adorns of pioneer. His life was an open book, enigma to some, wonder to others and anathema to the adherents of closed philosophy. His errors in political actions alienated his opponents, but somehow he followed the forces of history without conscious cognition of the same along right lines. What was the source of his knowledge ? Was it God or the people ? Perhaps both.

NOTES AND REFERENCES

1. Dr. S. Radhakrishan, *Great Indians.*
2. Rammanohar Lohia, *Marx, Gandhi and Socialism.*
3. *Ibid,*, p. 173.
4. *Ibid.* p. 120.
5. R.P. Dutta, *India Today*, p. 510.
6. M.K. Gandhi, *Towards Non-Violent Socialism*, p. 139.
7. Lohia, *Marx, Gandhi and Socialism* p. 125.
8. *Ibid.*, p. 127.
9. Lohia, *Ibid.* p. 135.
10. *Ibid.*, p. 236.
    (Dr. Lohia's exposition of the case is here relevant and has therefore been quoted. He said "A political and economic structure will have to be consciously designed such as would close the gap within the rations and

among nations. It is extremely doubtful if existing industrial technology can achieve such an aim. This technology began amongst a certain set of conditions, *one*, scarcer populations and larger lands; *two*, handsome capital and machine per head of population; thus industrial production for all the world carried out in a few West European lands. These are unique human conditions. They can not be duplicated. It is somewhat incomprehensible how the technology attendant on those conditions can be reproduced without them." p. 236, *Marx, Gandhi and Socialism*, Dr. Lohia advocated a small-unit technology for Indian conditions).

11. M.K. Gandhi, *Towards Non-Violent Socialism*, p. 33.
12. *Ibid.*
13. *Ibid.* p. 38.
14. Lohia, *Marx, Gandhi and Socialism.*
15. *Ibid.*

43

HUMANE SOCIALISM OF DR. LOHIA

ROHIT DAVE

Perhaps the most glowing tribute which the colleagues of Dr. Rammanohar Lohia paid to that outstanding personality was to cremate him at the electric crematorium in a simple ceremony. It symbolised the life-work of the departed leader who fought all his life against obscurantism in any shape or form and wherever found. When the dust of current political controversies settle down the key to the understanding of the personality of Dr. Lohia will be found in his vivid humanism, his firm conviction that man was at the centre of the universe and anything that stiffled the full maturing of each and every individual was an evil to be fought with all one's might. Casteism was one such force and no compromise with this institution was possible. Religious ceremonies symbolised casteism and so had to be eschewed even at the risk of hurting sentiments of the dear ones at a time when it would be the cruelest to do so. The decision was in the best of Gandhian tradition where a vital principle has to be followed to its logical fruition whatever the consequences. Dr. Lohia was a living symbol of this crucial aspect of Gandhism.

Dr. Lohia's contributions to socialist thought and action came out of this single-minded pre-occupation with the need to free the individual from the shackles that chained him all-round. He became one of the heroes of the *Quit India* movement because he was convinced that foreign domination had condemned Indians to be the second class citizens that could not look his fellow

human being from independent countries straight in the eyes. Colonialism obstructed free mingling of men and women all over the world, exploited the colonial people in the interest of the colonial powers, engendered a sense of inferiority in a human being destined to be the master of creation and, therefore, it had to be destroyed. This was the motivation for his fight for freedom and he had no difficulty in reconciling it with his concept of a world order with a world parliament elected by the people of the world directly on adult franchise. No such world order is possible as long as men are governed by considerations of race, religion and nationality. Dr. Lohia fully realised this and was content to campaign in favour of smaller regional organisations like the confederation covering the Indian sub-continent. He was also clear in his mind that as long as national sovereign States were in existence they should be ready to defend their territorial integrity and even national honour. But this should not blind man to the fact that one day a world order will have to emerge if mankind was not to perish in an atomic holocust.

DIGNITY OF MAN

The same passion for asserting the dignity of man, determined the contours of his socialism and his position on the language issue. He fought throughout for making man the centre of socialist concern. His socialist theory and the programme he advocated were meant to preserve the worth of man in the midst of vast techological changes that threaten to engulf him in gigantic impersonal organisations. He was one of the pioneers in advocating the development of intermediate technology that would help in making the best use of scientific advance in the service of man without making him a cog in the machine. His insistence in the four-pillar State likewise was meant to enable the lowliest of the low to participate in political power without endangering the unity of the nation. No economic or political order was acceptable to him that dehumanished a human personality.

This is most vividly brought out in his concept of an ideal leader. 'He would want not a flock of gapping, worshipping and greedy idiots, but a loyal people consisting of individuals who understand and work hard. He would want to be . . . one of the people, living almost like them, who moves them and is moved by

them to great new thoughts and great new deeds, who does not represent them but whom they represent.' He lived his best to live up to the ideal of the leader he preached. The Deputy Prime Minister, Mr. Morarji Desai, highlighted this feature of Dr. Lohia's personality when he said that he was one of the very few leaders to whom his followers and colleagues were attached and devoted. A leader that would 'appropriate to himself the task of saving his people by his own herculean effort and in the process, the luxury, spiritual and economic, of separation from his people' was not acceptable to him. The uniqueness of each individual as a spiritual entity in its own right was the sure foundation on which he built his political and economic doctrines. Decentralisation of economic and political power was only a manifestation of this deeprooted veneration of a human being and a passionate desire to continue the dialogue with him on terms of equality. 'I have said so much of the new leadership and the new people,' he wrote, 'for all trust is today lost and either distrusts the other; the new leader and the new people not alone on the national or international scale but also in the village and all over., It is difficult to come across a more penetrating analysis of the malaise that is afflicting the country today.

FIGHT AGAINST CASTEISM

The concern with preserving human integrity is nowhere more clearly demonstrated than in his campaign against the caste system. I am 'convinced,' he said, "that two segregations of caste and woman are primarily responsible for this decline of the spirit. These segregations have enough power to kill all capacity for adventure and joy." This conviction led him to advocate preferential opportunity to those who have so far been suppressed. 'When everybody has an equal opportunity, castes with five-thousand-year-old traditions of liberal education would be on top. Only the exceptionally gifted from the lower castes would be able to break through this tradition. . . . But how many could qualify ! Very few. It would be the battle of five thousand years of oppressive training and tradition against an individual talent. . . . To make this battle a somewhat equal encounter, unequal opportunities would have to be extended, to those who have been so far suppressed.' He went a step further and invited the youth of the

lower castes for 'the staffing of the nation's leadership as though it were some sacred work,' and he advised the more fortunate to mingle tradition with mass and thereby demonstrate their 'faith in the great crucible of the human race and equal faith in the vigour of all the Indian people. . . .' Not the imposing of the high caste morals and patterns of life on the lower caste but a genuine co-mingling of traditions, ability and manners was his conception of the desegregation of castes and communities in our country.

With these views on the cultural renaissance of India there is no wonder that be insisted on the use of regional languages for all purposes. He enjoyed great felicity in expressing his thoughts in English but insisted on using regional languages so as to reach the lowest strata of society. At times his attitude took an unfortunate form of contempt for the higher castes and more affluent sections of the community. But his main quarrel was not with the language or the content but with a great gulf between profession and practices. "They (Indian people) profess a philosophy of non-attachment, immaculate in its reasoning and more so in its insight, but practice the coarsest kind of attachment. They so cling to life that they prefer to live it on the lowest levels of misery rather than risk it in some great effort, and of greed of money and power, no people on earth give a greater exhibition.'

While all these ideas are found in the thoughts and writings of many modern leaders in our country today nowhere are they advocated with such a single-minded sense of dedication as was done by Dr. Lohia. A leading daily of India recently carried the following thought from John Haynes Holmes : "Evil is here in this word, not because God wants it or uses it here, but because he knows not how at the moment to remove it. Evil, therefore, is a fact not to be explained away, but to be accepted; and accepted not to be endured, but to be conquered. It is a challenge neither to our reason nor to our patience, but to our courage." This could well have been the motto of Dr. Lohia.

MALICE TO NONE

This crusading for the social order is which he believed with such conviction made him impatient with those who desired change but were not prepared to fight for it. As Mr. Rajagopala-chari pointed out he was angry with people who were not

angry as they should be. This attracted to him the charge of being eccentric, a non-conformist a rebel and an uncompromising radical. It also brought him in conflict with some of his closest colleagues. He always protested that he bore no malice against any one. In justification of one of his very severe attack at the late Prime Minister, Mr. Jawaharlal Nehru, he said : "I do not know how to term my heart or mind out to show, that there is no malice in it. What I am doing is with a view to rouse my people against waste as luxury. I am perhaps angry with the Prime Minister as with most of the country's upper classes, but that is all for I have seen far too many betrayals by too many of my colleagues to be anything more than frivolour where I choose to be bad. This frivoloury help me carry my burden." He was also charges with disturbing the dignity of the Parliament. But as Mr. Y.B. Chavan remarked with a heavy heart : "There would be a savoid in the Lok Sabha." He added : "He was always there to check us from going astrays. The opposition party leaders have paid him the tribute for his outstanding contribution in evolving an effective opposition in the Lok Sabha out of the disparate elements.

Men with original ideas impatient to realise them in their life time had to pay the price in the past, of being estranged from their closest colleagues and of being misunderstood and even condemned by the powers-that-be. Dr. Lohia was a part of that tradition. Soon, however, these acrimonies are forgotten and what remains is the sterling contribution to the stream of thought-elightening and inspiring generations for a long time to come. Dr. Lohia's dream of a cleaner, more honest, less hypocritical and more courageous individuals uniting in a meaningful web of social relationship will guide and inspire countless generations in India and all over the world and his intense humanism, egalitarianism, and fight against injustice in all forms will warm the hearts of those who are struggling to assert their dignity in the hostile world. Dr. Lohia has an abiding place in the history of socialist thought.

44

DR. LOHIA AND ASIAN SOCIALISM

PREM BHASIN

Describing the origins of the Congress Socialist Party, the Meerut thesis (January, 1936) stated thai it had grown "out of the experience of the last two national struggles. It was formed at the end of the last Civil Disobedience Movement by such Congressmen as came to believe that a new orientation of the national movement had become necessary—a redefinition of its objectives and revision of its methods. The initiative in this direction could be taken only by those who had a theoretical grasp of the forces of our present society. These naturally were those Congressmen who had come under the influance of and accepted Marxian Socialism... It follows that the party's own programme must be a Marxist one, otherwise the party will fail to fulfil its task and leadership. Marxism alone can guide the anti-imperialist forces to their ultimate destiny."

CLEAR DECLARATION

With this clear declaration in favour of Marxism it would have been natural for the CSP to seek and establish contact with Moscow and the Communist International. But, it was not done because, as Shri Jayaprakash Narayan has said : "The patently mistaken policy that the Comintern had been following since 1928, and which had resulted in the division of the labour and socialist movements throughout the world and in the isolation of the

communists in all the colonial countries... was contrary to Marxist theory generally and specifically to the famous colonial policy enunciated by Lenin."[1]

For the Social Democrats of Europe the CSP had neither any love nor respect. The experience of two Labour governments in Britain could not have made it otherwise.

The CSP thus, had no worthwhile international contacts or affiliation. But this did not mean that it had no thinking on international questions or did not have an international policy and outlook. Working at the head of the international section of the AICC at Allahabad, Dr. Rammanohar Lohia had, apart from his personal observations in Germany in the early thirties, studied the cross-currents of international forces and evolved an independent foreign policy for the dependent nation and the nascent party. It is significant that the two basic concepts of non-alignment and equal irrelevance had been worked out by him as early as 1938-39.

It was a difficult and confusing situation. War between fascism and imperialism was becoming more and more probable. The natural question was which is the greater evil? No one could deny that fascism was a danger to democracy and socialism. But imperialism was an equal danger to socialism and national liberation. What was the way out? Dr. Lohia was clear and firm: "I am both an anti-imperialist and a socialist. I know it is absurd to say this. A socialist must also be an anti-imperialist. And yet it is necessary for me to claim my two faiths separately, for now-a-days there are socialists who are suppressing the struggle against imperialism."[2] To the argument that fascism was an unmitigated evil, his rejoinder was that imperialism was not less so, and that no democratic nationalist could afford to choose between the two. As between anti-imperialism and anti-fascism, he projected the positive idea of undiluted commitment to democracy and nationalism.

The post-war world and the peace negotiations at Paris had provoked Acharya Narendra Deva to say in early 1947 that "there is no doubt that the American country has begun. But it will not be conducive to the welfare of the world. America is supporting reaction everywhere... American action is in fact giving birth to a new imperialism in the name of freedom and democracy.... Just as England has no principled foreign policy, so is Russia's policy not rooted in any principle In formulating its policies, Russia is not guided by considerations of new values commensurate with the

requirements of a new epoch. . . . Both blocs are afraid of each other and feverishly preparing for war. If the USA and England are organising a bloc of western States, Russia has brought under its domination the whole of Eastern Europe. It wants to throw up an embankment to stem the eastward tide of western powers by incorporating in its orbit all areas stretching from Finland in the North to Turkey-Syria in the South."[3]

This disillusionment with both the blocs, however, did not breed isolationism or lead Indian socialists to rule out all international co-operation and association. Talking advantage of the Asian Relations Conference, held in New Delhi in 1947, Indian socialists established contact with Indonesian, Burmese and other Asian socialists who had come to India in that connection, and mooted the idea of forming an organisation of socialist parties working in Asia. Elaborating the idea, Acharya Narendra Deva said : "The socialist parties of such Asian countries as are today fighting for their independence must assemble together. It will give mutual encouragement and strength to one another. The interests of the parties in such a convention will not be mutually contradictory, nor will anyone of these parties be able to suppress other parties. Only such elements should be called to this conference whose interests and objects are similar, who share a common ideology, and who are prepared to accord one another the status of equality."[4]

SHAPING THE POLICY

It was, however, left to Dr. Lohia to give a concrete shape to it and lay down the basic policy formulations of Asian socialism through his travels and writings, although almost six years had to elapse before the Asian Socialist Conference was formally born. He travelled to Egypt, Lebanon, Israel, Burma, Indonesia, and other countries in its quest

The guiding principle of the Asian socialists, according to him, must be the same as had impelled Indian, Burmese and Indonesian socialists to wage determined battles for national independence in the midst of the total war between imperialism and fascism. The situation at the end of the war was not dissimilar from the one preceding it. In place of the imperialist and the fascist blocs, the world was confronted with the hostility between

the 'democratic' and the 'socialist' blocs. The apologists of both were demanding alignment with the one or the other in the name people's freedoms and material progress. But Dr. Lohia categorically rejected alignment with either, and opted for non-alignment. Pronouncing the equal irrelevance of both the camps, he gave a call for organising a third camp in world affairs, which would have a positive commitment to both democracy and socialism.

EFFORTS BEAR FRUIT

His almost single-handed efforts bore fruit, and a preliminary meeting of representatives of the socialist parties of Burma, Indonesia and India was held in Rangoon, where Dr. Lohia had led the Indian delegation. An agreement was reached on March 25, 1952, not only on the need for formally launching an Asian Socialist Conference, but also on the basic principles of the organisation. It was decided that a Preparatory Committee, consisting of one representative each from Burmese, Indonesian and Indian parties, would be set up in Rangoon to make preparations for and hold the conference there.

Why was it necessary to set up a separate organisation for Asian socialists when the Cominform, on the one hand, and the Socialist International, with which the Socialistal Party of India had already established formal relations, on the other, were already actively functioning ? The joint statement of the Socialist parties of Burma, Indonesia and India explained the position of Asian socialists in a few short and pithy paragraphs :

"Socialism and socialist movement," it said, "started in the western world as a logical consequence and opponent of capitalism;

"Capitalism based on the profit motive gave birth to imperialism and colonialism. It has not been able to provide the means for the emancipation of the masses. It is a form of the exploitation of man by man.

"Cominform communism denies in practice dignity and equality of man.

"Its views and convictions cannot be separated from the position of Soviet Russia, which it regards as its bulwark. Cominformists are essentially, merely the vanguards, observers and informers of Soviet Russia.

"In the Cominform countries there exists a dictatorship of the Cominform parties, employing methods of terror of the secret police, which is also felt in the sphere of production.

"For these reasons, the Asian socialist parties reject both capitalism and Cominform communism."

There was no mention of western socialism or of the Socialist International.

The statement then went on to affirm the Asian Socialists' belief in 'planned production for use of society and not for profit of a few," "social justice," "nationalised" and "co-operative" sectors of economy, "democratic rights of the people," permission to "opposition political parties" to operate freely, a "democratic administrative machinery as opposed to bureaucratic administrative machinery," and "international co-operation and peace based on justice."

Even a casual perusal of this joint statement will indicate that it embodied a compromise between the viewpoints of the three parties. The Burmese party, which was the mainstay of the U Nu government, was not only pronouncedly Marxist but was engaged in a desperate duel with the local communists, who had launched an insurrection in company with the reactionary and separatist Karens. The Indonesians also had to fight and quell a communist insurrection. It was, in fact, the communist insurrectionary period in South and South-East Asia. India, Pakistan, Burma, Malaya, Thailand, Indonesia, the Phillippines and other countries were sought to be thrown into a turmoil by Stalin to prevent the newly-emerging democratic nationalist forces from consolidating their positions and to divert western energies from Europe to Asia. The bitterness of Asian socialists against Soviet Russia and its local instruments was only natural and understandable. It found its reflection in the elaboration of the criticism of the "cominformists" and their methods. Western imperialism was let off relatively mildly. But, the rejection of "capitalist democracy" (because it "provides political rights only, and not social rights") was noticeable, as was the emphasis on "democratic administration" and "complete emancipation of the broad masses of Asia."

COMPROMISE OF VIEWS

This compromise, however, contained within it the seeds of controversies. The first Asian Socialist Conference was held in

Rangoon on January 6-15, 1953, but Dr. Lohia did not attend it! Was it his "temperament" that was responsible for his absence at the conference, which was, without doubt, the crowning point of his incessant labours and initiative, or was it that he had started developing an uneasy feeling about some of the trends that had become visible to him at that time? Frankly, to this moment, I have not been able to make up my mind about it. May be, it was both.

Writing about the Rangoon Conference, Mr. Moshe Sharett, who was the Prime Minister of Israel and leader of the Israeli delegation, noted the dichotomy in the Asian Socialists' mind and the compromise formulations that had emerged out of the conference. According to him, "What characterised the entire trend of the proceedings was the struggle between the conception of Asian distinctiveness and world unity. . . . The approach to the problem of world peace was actuated by the ambition of certain Asian countries to play the part of a third force between the two rival blocs. On this issue, again, opinions clashed sharply. In the resolution eventually adopted the prevalent trend emerged in a considerably modified form. The Conference registered its protest against the continuation of the process of international polarisation as aggravating the menace to world peace. But in the same breath it repudiated ideological neutralism, urged the strengthening of all democratic countries to resist aggression and pledged itself to the idea of the active defence of democracy against external and internal perils."[5]

Dr. Lohia attended the Hyderabad (August 1953) and Kalaw (Burma—May 1954) meetings of the Bureau of the Asian Socialist Conference. It was at Kalaw, however, that the simmering conflict in outlooks really burst into the open, and Dr. Lohia clashed with U Kyaw Nyein, treasurer of the Asian Socialist Conference and chairman of its Anti-Colonial Bureau.

In his introductory remarks, about the capitalist and communist varieties of colonialism, U Kyaw Nyein had said: "To my mind, both types of colonialism are dangerous. In fact, the Soviet type of imperialism is, perhaps, even more degrading and even more dangerous, because it is more ruthless, more systematic and more blatantly justified in the name of world communist revolutions."[6]

ASIAN COMPLACENCY

How could Dr. Lohia allow it to go unchallenged ? He began by agreeing with U Kyaw Nyein that Soviet imperialism was ruthless and blatant. He agreed also that it was necessary not only to caution the Asians against complacency towards it, but also to expose it for all it was. But, then, he issued a warning against comparing Soviet imperialism to "democratic" imperialism to the disadvantage of the former. "Such comparisons often lead to a choice, also called the choice of the lesser evil. There should be no such choice or preference, not at least by the Asian socialist... In point of fact, I do not see how anything can be more barbaric than the terror carried out by capitalist imperialism in Indo-China or Kenya. In point of theory, socialism can win, certainly in Asia, only if it builds up attitude of mind that keeps away as sharply from the Atlantic camp as from the Soviet camp, from capitalism as well as communism. To prefer one is to weaken our capacity to combat the other and to build our own wav. The battle for men's minds is as decisive as the battle for their bodies. In this battle, Asian socialists must anchor their faith in equal rejection of all imperialisms and they creeds that give them birth. Socialists may also remember that only to the extent that they intensify their struggle against capitalism will it be possible for them to combat communism."[7]

THE FINAL SPLIT

The first split soon overtook the Indian Socialist Party, and the Kalaw meeting proved to be the last meeting of the ASC that Dr. Lohia attended. But, it is possible that even without the split he might have avoided further active participation in ASC deliberations. In his life, he had never hesitated to turn away from any group or organisation that had forsaken the path he had chalked out, even if he had been instrumental in bringing it about and nurturing it with his own lifeblood.

More than 18 years have elapsed since then. But events have proved that the words he had spoken at Kalaw are as true and relevant today, in national as well as international sphere, as they were when they were spoken.

Notes and References

1. *From Socialism to Sarvodaya*.
2. *Congress Socialist*, 2-4-1938.
3. Prof. Mukut Beharilal, *Acharya Narendra Deva—Yug Aur Netratva*,
4. Prof. Mukut Beharilal.
5. *Janata*, May 17, 1953.
6. *Janata*, June 20, 1954.
7. *Janata*, June 20, 1954.

45

LOHIA'S QUEST FOR A NEW DIMENSION

MADHU DANDAVATE*

"*He glorified the chains and jails of his captors into the shining ornaments of martyrdom.*"

This was the eloquent tribute paid to Mahatma Gandhi by the Negro, leader Mrs. Mary Bethune. How appropriate would be this homage in the case of Dr. Rammanohar Lohia as well ! Dr. Lohia more than any one else wieldded most effectively the Gandhian weapon of satyagraha, even after Independence, to fight every form of injustice against the oppressed and the neglected. If Leon Trotsky, one of the leaders of the Russian Revolution, professed the theory of "permanent revolution," Dr. Lohia preached and practised the concept of "permanent civil disobedience" as a peaceful rebellion against injustice. To the overeautions "pragmatists" both of them appeared as "visionaries" or, to quote the uncharitable critics, as "eccentrics." However, was not the father of out nation who showed obsession for 'swadeshi,' 'satyagraha' and 'non-co-operation,' dubbed a "fadist" and "eccentric" ? History records ample evidence to show that the revolutionaries whom their contemporaries dubbed 'eccentries' were held bo the succeeding generations as great beacon lights.

TAEORY OF IMMEDIACY

On the question of dynamics of action the traditional debate

* Finance Minister, Government of India, New Delhi.

has been as to whether action should precede the organisation or whether organisatian should be a by-product of the programme of action. In his Presidential Address to the National Convention of the Socialist Party, held in May 1952 at Panchmarhi, Dr. Lohia added a new dimension to this debate by propounding the theory of "immediacy in struggle and organisation." Those who mechanically applied their mind to the problems of organisation and indefinitely waited for the struggle to ripen at the highest stage of organisational work completely missed the opportunity to join the minstream of the nation's struggle. The best instance is that of the RSS which for years harped on perfecting a disciplined organisation in search of the "opportune moment" for launching a struggles for independence. In this process the RSS remained completely isolated from the current of the freedom struggle. The other extreme is the adventurist actionsits who considered organisation as the subsidiary part of militant struggles and hoped that sharpening of people's struggles would itself throw up the necessary organisation with a millitant outlook. Dr. Lohia exposed the futility of both these extreme viewpoints and pleaded in his theory of "immediacy" that organisation and action must continue as parallel currents. The preparations for organisation are to be linked up with the perspective of a programme of action and even in the midst of the most militant and dynamic action, the claims of organisation are not to be sacrificed. A careful study of revolutionary movements the world over has vindicated the correctness of this perspective so ably put forward by Dr. Lohia.

Soon after the Second World War, when the Socialist Party had commendable strength in organisation as well as action, Dr. Lohia had revealed a most constructive and refreshing mind. He strongly pleaded for "constructive militancy" and "militant construction." In his own inimitable style he described the "spade, prison and vote" as the symbols of this new perspective of action and construction. It was Dr. Lohia's imagination that, when the mammoth Janwani march of the people proceeds to Rashtrapati Bhavan to present to the President of India the charter of demands it should do so after passing through hundreds and thousands of villages on its way undertaking m⁻.ss constructive activities like digging wells, building bunds and cleansing the tanks with a direct involvement of the villagers in this mass constructive work. It was a novel scheme indeed in which the people on the march reconciled

the spirit of struggle with the spirit of construction. Will the socialist movement of our time show the robustness to recapture once again that spirit of constructive militancy ? That would be the most meaningful tribute to the memory of the late Dr. Lohia.

SEARCH FOR IDENTITY

Ever since the formation of the Congress Socialist Party in 1934, the socialist movement in India has been in search of an ideological identity. In the initial stages the vague generalisations of Marxism dominated the ideology of the Party. Many developments in the socio-economic field in Europe and elsewhere had challenged the validity of some of the basic postulates of Marxism. History had posed many questions that remained unanswered by Marxism. Unfortunately the socialists, too, had not displayed an enquiring mind to examine some of the fundamental formulations of the Marxian theory. The situation remained fluid till the Second World War. The period of the War represented a period of ideological churning in the socialist movement. The process continued even in the post-War years. It cannot be denied that Dr. Rammanohar Lohia with his fresh mind made the most valuable contribution to this process of rethinking in the socialist movement.

In his well-known article "Economics After Marx," written during the Second World War, Dr. Lohia sharply analysed the basic premiees of the Marxian thought. His approach was most non-doctrinaire. He emphasised that no individual's thought could be made the sole frame of reference for the ideology of a movement. That summed up his attitude to Marx as well as to Gandhi. "I want the winds of all culutres to blow freely about my house, but not to be swept-off my feet by any," said Mahatma Gandhi. These words of Gandhiji were the corner-stone or Dr. Lohia's approach to the ideological problems of the socialist movement. He showed the willingness to assimilate in the socialist movement those elements of Marxism which had stood the test of time, but he did not blindly accept some of the postulates of Marxism which were proved to be irrelevant to the new situation. Dr. Lohia, therefore, accepted broadly Marx's scientific method of interpreting history but at the same time he realised the limitations of this interpretation. Dr. Lohia emphasised the economic factors

do contribute to the development of history but the human will, too, was a factor to be recknoned with. In his own picturesque way he stated that the "logic of events" as well as the "logic of will" governs the path of human history.

Dr. Lohia seriously contested the claim of Marxism that revolution would take place at the highest level of economic and industrial development in a society. The facts that revolution took place in an economically backward country like Russia and it was bypassed in an industrially developed society in England and America confirm more Dr. Lohia's analysis than the prediction of Marx.

The thread which Dr. Lohia had left in his article "Economics After Marx" was later picked up by him in his Presidential Address at Panchmarhi in 1952. He bared the kinship between the techniques of production both under communism and capitalism and claimed that they irrelevant to two-thirds of the world which was underdeveloped and had high density of population, inadequacy of capital and large unemployment. Dr. Lohia brought out the most glaring fact that communism borrowed from capitalism its conventional production techniques, it only sought to change relationship among the forces of producution. Such a process, Dr. Lohia emphasised, was completely unsuited to the conditions prevailing in India. He, therefore, pleaded for a small-unit technology and the corresponding decentralised economy which is not to be confused with the Gandhian economy based on village self-sufficiency. Dr. Lohia's insistence was on research and innovation to invest a new small-unit machine run on electricity or diesel that could be taken to the remotest villages of India so as to fulfil the twin claims of providing jobs to the rural population and of augmenting production. Dr. Lohia claimed that such a small-unit technology would be able to overcome the difficulties created by inadequacy of capital; and the technique being labour-intensive, it would also eliminate to a great extent the concealed rural unemployment.

PREFERENTIAL OPPORTUNITY

The traditional socialist thought based on pure "economic determinism" could not provide solutions to the problems of the tradition-bound Indian society which was marked not only by

sharp class distinctions but by caste stratifications as well. The social exploitation resulting out of these caste stratifications had plagued Indian society for centuries and strait-jacket theory of class struggle could not provide answers to the complex questions created by our society. Dr. Lohia's greatest contribution to the socialist movement in his concept of a total revoultion that would envelop the economic as well as the social field. He strongly pressed the viewpoint that Indian society oscillated between class and caste and unless the submerged castes and communities were liberated the task of revolution in India would never be complete. Even in the face of fierce opposition from the upper-caste orthodoxy, Dr. Lohia strongly espoused the cause of "preferential opportunities" for the backward castes and communities. Since these weaker sections of society have developed a lag for centuries, mere equality of opportunity wouldn't help in lifting up the oppreseed sections from the miserable depths of degradation to which they have sunk. The concept of preferential opportunities to the weaker sections has been widely accepted today as an integral part of socialist thinking in India.

NOT THE SAME FATE

The scientific core of Marxian thought has been destroyed by the doctrinaire and dogmatic Marxists while Gandhiji's ideals have been buried by Gandhians who have reduced the Gandhian way of life to a mere ritual. The Socialists in India must ensure that Dr. Lohia's valuable contribution, which has introduced a new dimension in socialist thought and action, does not meet the same fate.

46

MARX, GANDHI AND LOHIA

USHA MEHTA*

> "The long pilgrimage of socialism has been to end the exile of man and his agonising self-alienation." —*Lohia*

Many and varied have been the influences that have shaped socialist thought in India. In the earlier period of its evolution, socialism was more or less synonymous with orthodox Marxism, offering not merely a scientific account of the historical evolution of society but a guide to revolutionary action. In this period Gandhi was derided as a reactionary hampering the process of social transformation.

However, a period of rethinking and self-analysis set in during the Second World War, when some of the Gandhian principles were re-examined in the light of the socialist and communist movements all over the world as also in view of the special economic problems facing the country. As a result, both socialist thought and movement came to be influenced by Gandhian teachings and techniques. Among those who tried to give a new orientation of Marxist and Gandhian principles, Lohia who tried to work out the the doctrinal foundation of socialism occupies the pride of place.

At the Pachmarhi Session of the Socialist Party in 1952, when Lohia was asked to say in unequivocal terms whether he was

* Professor of Political Science, University of Bombay, Bombay,

pro or anti-Marx, he made his position clear by saying : "It is silly to be a Gandhian or Marxist and it is equally so to be an anti-Gandhian or anti-Marxist. There are priceless treasures to learn from Gandhi as from marx; but the learning can only be done when the frame of reference does not derive from an age or a person."[1]

In Lohia's opinion, some of Marx's formulations like the theory of evolution of capitalism for example, are inadequate. Communism, no doubt, destroys private property but in as much as it seeks the technological restoration of capitalism after doing this, it fails to fulfil its economic aim, and hence he did not accept Marx in toto.

BORROWED BREATH

Lohia believed that socialism had lived on 'borrowed breath' for long. It had borrowed its economic aim—establishment of social ownership of the existing means of production and planned economy—from communism and non-economic and general aim—preservation of democracy, freedom and other human rights—from capitalism. It was his endeavour to formulate a new and integrated doctrine of socialism going beyond both these ideologies as also beyond Gandhian thought by seeking their essence and attempting a new integration. His was an attempt to overcome the opposition between matter and spirit, between bread and culture. Explaning his attitude, he observed : "Expanding knowledge and the method of dialectical materialism may reveal the flux. Compassion and contemplation or the method of spirituality may reveal the externity. But the two methods must inform one another. Dialectical materialism by itself may well be termed dialectical idealism and *vice versa*."[2]

He resolves the opposition between the individual and the social by looking upon the individual both as an end and a means; "as an end he is the unfolder of love unto all; as a means, he is the tool of revolutionary anger against tyranny."[3] Similarly, he emphatically holds the view that in view of the situation prevailing in two-thirds of the world today, bread and freedom, far from being antagonistic, have become inseparable and have to be pursued simultaneously.

Though Lohia does accept class struggle as the dynamics of

social change, unlike Marx, he does not accept that all human history is the history of class struggle. It, no doubt, hastens the, destruction of capitalism, but it cannot be accepted as the sole cause determining the course of history as, along with class struggles, race struggles also have played an equally important role. In India, caste, too, has played some part in social evolution. Emphasising this fact, Lohia maintains : "It appears true to say that mankind has alternated between the stabilising of classes into castes and the loosening of castes into classes."[4] He sees in the communist movements of Europe attempts to attain the stability of castes, whereas in India, castes were loosening into classes. In view of the fact that these two processes of stabilising and loosening have taken place at different levels in different places and ages, he comes to the conclusion that "all human history is the history of internal osciallation between classes and castes and of external shifts in power and prosperity."[5] Over and above these two, social and economic equality—at least approximation to it—forms the third driving force of history.

EQUALITY AND BEYOND

Equality as conceived by Lohia is much more than an abstract principle of universal validity. It is his aim to translate abstract equality into concrete reality. Referring to the part the State has to play for attaining this ideal, he says : "Statecraft requires such a concrete concept as is based on maximum immediate attainability of the cherised end. If one is overwhelmed by the current situation, one becomes a conservative or a reactionary; if one adopts an unrealisable aim, one becomes irrelevant. Idealism verges on insanity, but practicability also verges on reaction."[6] To avoid both these extremes, the State will first have to take recourse to a process of 'levelling down' and follow it up with a process of 'levelling up.'

Lohia suggests a new mode of rationalisation accompanied by a corresponding mode of ownership based on the principle of decentralisation. Small-unit machines run by electricity or oil and built on the principle of immediacy in operation and output, socialisation of all property used as a means of production which hire labour, economic planning and having a four-pillar State functioning at the levels of village, district, province and centre are some

of the devices which, according to him, will bring a sense of joyous fulfilment to all concerned. The concept of the four-pillar State in which all the four limbs are integrated in a system of functional federalism as akin to Gandhi's concept of decentralised democracy and his idea of the power pattern taking the form of oceanic circles rather than that of a pyramid with as apex sustained by the bottom.

Lohia does not rest content with a more equitable distribution of material things for he realises that if socialists continue to think only in material terms, theirs would be a limited appeal. Equality as interpreted by him is a comprehensive concept including spiritual with material and inward with outward equality. By material equality is meant outward kinship as also inward equanimity ! As he observes, "only an integrated concept of these four meanings of equanimity, kinship, material equality within the nation and among nations is worthy to become a supreme aim of life and its purpose."[7] This is in keeping with the latest trend in socialist thinking which, instead a resting content with securing equality of opportunity for all, asks the further question 'equality for what ?' and insists that there must be some standards according to which the opportunities provided are to be judged. As the Socialist Union maintains, "what socialists value are all those opportunities which enable people to live in freedom and fellowship, which enrich the content of life and put quality into equality."[8] Again Lohia's insistence on comparative disciplining of wants within the framework of social ownership along with comparative multiplication of produce meant to emphasise the qualitative aspect of equality reminds us of Gandhi's views on socialism. "Socialism," said Gandhi, "is no copy-book maxim or a lifeless institutional framework. It is pure as crystal requiring crystal-like means to achieve it."[9]

PROGRAMME OF ACTION

Like Marx, Lohia is as much interested in giving a firm foundation to the theory of socialism as in giving appropriate forms of action through which the doctrine may be implemented and the final goal realised. The aim of such action should be to organise people's will and reconstruct national life.

> *He wanted that socialists should give a programme which not merely excites but also consolidates. This can be done by bringing about a comprehensive, seven-fold revolution through three instruments—the spade, the vote and the prison.*

The communists and the democratic socialists of the West knew only two methods for bringing about a social change—insurrectionary overthrow of the State by violence and the democratic process of the ballot box—and it was generally believed that backward Asian countries could not rely on the ballot box for achieving their end.

According to Lohia, the choice for the socialists is not between the ballot and the bullet, between parliament and insurrection, as is generally believed; it is between 'satyagraha' and the bullet. The ballot undoubtedly has its place but when injustice and oppression assume unbearable proportions, the only course left open to justice-loving people is to take recourse to the matchless remedy of civil disobedience. He sees no opposition between class struggle and civil disabedience. "While civil disobedience is indeed a mode to change the heart of the opponent," argues he, "it is even more an effort to reduce his power, reduction of the power of the evil and increase in the power of the good."[10] Asian socialism cannot be gradual; it will have to be drastic and unconstitutional, though peaceful. Such a revolution will combine the twin principles of sympathy for all and anger against injustice.

Revolution as visualised by Lohia is comprehensive and all-embracing. He calls it a seven-fold revolution, including the procedural revolution, and those meant to remove inequalities resulting from sex, caste, race or colour which are responsible for restricted opportunities for women and those belonging to the lower castes or the colured people and the revolt of subject people all over the world against their unjust rulers. In this world of gross inequalities, another important revolution is that of the poor or the little man against the rich or the big man. Keeping in view the compulsion which goes with planning, Lohia mentions one more revolution—a revolution which aims at protecting the privacy of the individual against encroachment by the collective State. Lastly, he talked of revolution against the indiscrimate use of war weapons. One thing on which he insists is that revolution

must be moral in the sense that it would have truthfulness and character building as its bases. This he intends doing through constructive work, through the party and through civil disobedience. He would very much like the socialists to be good men and adopt good and peaceful means as far as possible but he would not wait for all men to be good before launching a civil disobededience movement.

VIOLENCE AND NON-VIOLENCE

A question that is often raised regarding the character of revolution is whether it is to be violent or non-violent. Non-violence, as Lohia used to say, was one of his loadstones for a long time. In one of his speeches delivered from the Congress Radio in 1942, he said : "Ours is a new principle which goes to the new world where no one kills another or sucks another; and for a new world, we are willing to give our own blood. The Ganges will flow with blood but it will flow with Indian blood. We ask not a drop of the enemy's blood in return for what we have suffered."[11] He, however, wanted the socialists and revolutionaries to remember that non-violence consists of two qualities—civility or weaponlessness and resistance. Remembering that both are equally important he exhorts them to be equally loyal to both. This is why on hearing about the police massacre of innocent women in Ashti and Chimur during the "Quit India" struggle, without a moment's hesitation he advised the victims thus : "You should try to prevent acts of rape as any other non-violent resister but if you are free and still alive, then kill or get killed, for rape is outside politics." Thus, the use or non-use of violence, according to him, and that too in the last stages of a revolution, is a matter of irrelevance or secondary detail. He applied the same standard to the use of non-violence so far as international disputes are concerned. International non-violence had been an incohate hope with him. Though he loved peace and revolution against weapons, after seeing the battles in Indo-China, he began advocating the use of weapons. Clarifying his position, he asserted : "I may not use the bullet for victory over another's home, but when my own country is attacked, I would not hesitate to use any weapon that is necessary and available."[13]

Thus, Lohia, who was both a theoretician of the Socialist

Party and a leader of the socialist movement, tried to accommodate and assimilate some of the most important contributions of Gandhi to the theory and methodology of socialism though he did not accept all his principles or methods unquestioningly. He developed his own frame of reference and accepted only as much of Gandhism or Marxism as fitted into this frame. He held the Mahatma in high esteem and yet, like Marx, he was wedded to revolution in thought, word and deed. It can, therefore, be rightly concluded that Lohia was a Gandhian among revolutionaries and a revolutionary among Gandhians.

Notes and References

1. 'Economics After Marx' in *Marx, Gandhi and Socialism*, Navhind, Hyderabad. 1963, p. 1.
2. 'A New Integration,' *Ibid.*, p. 373.
3. *Ibid.*, p. 375.
4. 'Driving Forces of History,' *Ibid.*, p, 258.
5. *Ibid.*, p. 259.
6. 'Abstract and Concrete,' *Ibid*, p. 231.
7. The Meaning of Equality,' *Ibid.*, p. 241.
8. Socialist Union, *Twentieth Century Socialism*, Penguin Books, 1956, p. 145.
9. Gandhi, M.K., *Harijan*, 13-7-1947.
10. 'The Doctrinal Foundation of Socialism, *Marx, Gandhi and Socialism*, p. 346.
11. From an unpublished speech.
12. *Ibid.*
13. Preface, *Marx, Gandhi and Socialism*, p. XXXXV.

47

DR. LOHIA AND GANDHI'S LEGACY

RAGHUVANSH

In order to understand Dr. Lohia one has to understand the legacy of Gandhiji. Gandhiji's successors are frequently referred to by name. Most of the time the names mentioned are Nehru and Shri Vinoba Bhave. If we remember the total, unified personality of Gandhiji it becomes impossible to call anyone person his scccessor. The whole country and the whole people bear his legacy in a manifold manner. If any one leader considered that legacy in such comprehensive manner and bore it dutifully, it was Rammanohar Lohia. He was not even remotely connected with the Establishment that Gandhi might have left either in as political or spiritual aspects. These seats have been decorated by other honourable gentlemen. But apart from these prestigious posts, Gandhi had left the legacy of a unique revolution for the transformation not only of society but also towards the evolution of a new equality for all mankind. A legacy of this type is neither transferred nor taken over, it is to be borne voluntarily like the cross. Lohia accepted the burden in this sense, he continued the search for the soul of his nation and society in the total context of humanity.

Gandhiji had a deep insight into the society he lived in, his personality showed continuous communication with the common man. Indian leaders of renaissance who preceded him had experienced the impact of the west on their traditional society, they were profoundly influenced by the values of modern European

civilization, by its historical outlook, scientific attitude and humanism. They became inclined towards the west for the sake of such ideals as freedom, equality, individual liberty, democrocy and socialism. From Raja Rammohan Roy to Swami Vivekananda one can discern the same gratitude and debt. We may not mention here those products of Macaulay's education policy who became a horde of slaves for the European governments. This class was all along patronised by the British and their government in India, but they were equipped with power and respectability under Nehru. While expanding its sphere of domination it proclaimed very loud support to the demestic and foreign policies of Nehru. When Lohia with his Gandhian legacy stuggled against Nehru's policies, the latter used this class against Lohia.

All the renaissance leaders before Gandhi—Rammohan Roy, Keshab Chandra Sen, Dayanand, and Vivekananda—were inspired by European values and standards while striving for a rewakening of their country Naturally they discovered a lot of evils in the contemporary Indian society. They made Herculean efforts to liberate their country from the evils of superstition and backwardness.

At the same time, in order to bring India's glory on a par with that of Europe they had to hark back to the grandeur of the past. They interpreted ancient traditions in the light of modern western ideas. They were dazzled by modern civilization and yet so obsessed with India's past, that they could neither properly assess the modern civilization nor could they discern traditional essence in the extant society of today.

All these great men who were first attracted by western ideals and then tried to reform their society had a surfacial encounter with tradition as well as modernity. Gandhiji, however, instead of invoking the greatness of the past identified himself with the whole of Indian society. He accepted the life of the people as they lived, and discovered its harmony. He did realise that the stream of Indian life had been obstructed and that it suffered from inertia. At the same time he knew that this traditional life has some inherent qualities which will be essential for reconstruction of this society. Because he accepted the life of his people without any reservations, he could pierce through its rot and inerita and perceive the vital flow deep within.

Nor was his encouter with European civilization surfacial. He experienced it more deeply than others, including Nehru. He was

neither dazzled nor obsessed; he established a kindred relationship with the West. Just as he perceieed the inertia and the vitality of the Indian situation simultaneously, so also he encountered the basic elan of the West along with its jarring note of mechanized culture. So he did not have to imitate the West, although he acknowledged its strength. He realised that India could not achieve modernity by following the European model. On the one hand. that would render our progress imitative and subsidiary. Secondly, after having directed all their intelligence and ability towards the realisation of such ideals as freedom, equality, opportunity and collective, progress, the Europeans have now surrendered themselves to more and more mechanization of everything. So while Gandhiji on the one hand aimed at realising the values of European culture through the utilisation of the native genius, he was certain not to take the same direction as Europe did.

Lohia like Gandhi identified himself with his country and society, instead of just understanding it he accepted it as his own. Without such deep involvement it is not possible on the part of anyone to comprehend the life of the nation in a full sense. Nehru was essentially an 'outsider', he never identified himself with his people—it was not in keeping with his nature and personality. His understanding of Europe too was romantic, and when he became the Prime Minister of India after Independence, he tried to remake India in the image of that imaginary Europe. In result, he only created a class of people, cut off from the innumerable masses, who had a vested interest in the imitation of Europe in India. Different was Lohia who established a living relationship with the hungry and backward millions and strove to kindle the fire in them as the only sure way to create a new society. Sometimes it looked as if he was breaking all values and traditions, and his opponents called him opportunist, anarchist and even un-Indian. But Lohia like Gandhi was unflinching in his effort to base his revolution on Indian experience.

Gandhi through his insight gave direction and dynamism to Indian life. He did not undergo any lengthy analysis or study of history in order to arrive at his principle. His approach was both idealistic and empirical. He acted according to his ideals on the basis of his experience of the immediate surroundings through which he embraced the whole of humanity. Those who insisted on ideological systems regarded his politics as one of

compromise. Its impact on his followers also was not very deep since there was always scope for hypocrisy. Lohia's genius gave it a new turn; he interpreted Gandhi's politics and rationalistic terms. He subjected Gandhian assumptions to rigorous scientific analysis and discussion in terms of national, social and human problems: and demonstrated that the Gandhians ideal of changing society was no less revolutionary.

Gandhi had earlier rejected the historical viewpoint of Europe, without contradicting it theoretically. Lohia examined the historical theories and exposed them as an intellectual stratagem for proving and preserving Europe's excellence. All great men and thinkers look at history from a subjective viewpoint, from the viewpoint of one's own national situation, and through the endeavour to promote the welfare of that society. Thus all the theories about cultural progress and decline propounded by philosophers like Toynbee, Spengler and Sorokin have Europe in the centre of their thought. When they look at the history of Europe their mind is coloured by the European culture of which they are a part; and when they mediate on the problem of culture and civilization they base their judgement mainly on their experience of European history. Thus there is today no theory of cultural evolution which applies to all societies and their various cultural stages and manifestations. All these formulations per-prominence to the European experience whereas the picture that emerges about the coloured men and their history is a distorted one. Lohia underscored the need for studying and understanding the historical process from the viewpoint of our present ambitions and outlook. This is the likely valid way of looking at history.

Gandhi always put his country and his people at the centre of his thought and section. The implication was that the highest principle that one propounded have relevance only when they are practised and need up to in one's own society. He formulated his social, political and economic thoughts in the context of his own people, their conditions and their tradition. He tried to deeply apply them along the evolution of his own people. However, he never lost sight of the broad interests of the mankind as a whole. Lohia also contemplated mankind's nature only on the basis of the progress of its own country and its like. He was not in the company of Indian leaders who often talk airily about human freedom, equality and man's future without concretising their

meaning in terms of the actual conditions in which millions of their countrymen, poor, backward, underdeveloped and illiterative live. So a great separation between speech and action, ideals and practice, has become the special feature of Indian politics. Lohia continued the Gandhian strain of concretising all ideals in terms of the immediate surroundings, and made a Herculean effort to clear the atmosphere of untruth, loose talk and meaningless high-flown words like non-violence, service to the nation, equality, national Integration and so on. He became notorious for taking all leaders to task, both of the ruling party and the opposition, for their empty talk.

Gandhi had broadly hinted his attitude in matters of foreign policy. He had advocated that India's future should be linked more with the fate of the poor and underdeveloped nations rather than the advanced peoples of the west. Lohia extended this principle of Gandhiji while formulating his critique of India's foreign policy. He argued that it was futile to try to take advantage of the tension and balance of power between the powerful nations of the world; it would neither serve the purpose of raising the welfare of our own masses, nor would it be useful for the social, political, economic and cultural liberation of the downtrodden nations of the world. To be a partisan in this contest or to pose to be non-aligned between the two is the same ultimately, for the powerful countries always use the weak nations for their own balance. There are always possibilities of the old centres of power coming nearer and new centres coming up—both these processes are taking place in the present. In such a world situation the future of the poor and backward nations will always remain dark, for the advanced nations will always be devising new ways of exploiting them and the inequalities among nations will never be bridged. So, Lohia pleaded, there was no other way than forming a Third Camp of these weaker nations.

In post-Independence India some elite and status quoist leaders and parties had started denouncing all forms of direct action. They argued that the people should have no right to agitate against the government and majority decisions of the legislatures once these were popularly elected. This view not only betrays an utter lack of understanding, but is definiteiy anti-people and undemocratic. Lohia fought heroically against this tendecy and reasserted the validity of satyagraha in the new context. Elections

involve a lot of expenses, manipulations and waiting for five years, and the influential and powerful sections tend to gain the upper hand. So unless there are methods of fighting against injustice and oppression immediately, the wealthy and powerful elements are sure to dominate the election process in an unquestioned manner. Lohia forcefully defended the people's right to undertake civil disobedienee as the most effective means of mobilising people's aspirations and strength. When it came to putting principles to practice, Lohia could stake all his life and personality. He evolved new modes of satyagraha like *Bandh* and *Gherao* whose use made the authorities, the vested interests and the opportunists uncomfortable. All these elements combined to malign him and his methods, but Lohia like Gandhi was indomitable spirit.

Lohia envisaged a four-pillared structure of the State based on self-rule from the bottom and without the overriding authority of an all-powerful centre. Except such subjects as defence, foreign policy and trade, all problems that directly concern the lives of the people should be subjects of the lower units in which the masses can participate from close qaurters. He also pleaded for the establishment of a world government without which and without equality among nations real equality among men would never be feasible. Thus he systematised Gandhiji's idea of village self-rule and *Panchayat Raj*, for he like Gandhi believed that so long as the masses did not involve themselves in the processes of changing the political, administrative, economic, educational and cultural modern and institutions, democracy and socialism will remain as empty slogans.

Similarly, he accepted Gandhi's basic thought on economic problems, although he was all out for making use of scientific and technological knowhow. He agreed with Gandhi's opposition to immediate and full industrialisation and mechanization. He made a deep and extensive study of the problem. He found that such a method was not incapable of satisfying the needs of our ever-growing population, but it cannot even provide them with the maximum requirements of living. We cannot imitate 19th century Europe which exploited its own masses as well as those of the colonies in order to carry through its industrialisation. We have to devise ways by which we can improve the people's the gradually but continuously. Simple technological knowhow harnessed to small and village industries can utilise the maximum of human

labour and thereby increase production. Similarly, by advocating celing on expenditure, Lohia was only giving revolutionary turn to the idea of trusteeship. Gandhi asked the capitalists, merchants and landlords to act as trustees, that is to say, to use all their wealth at resources for the total development of the community. This has not taken place and on the contrary our plans have consolidated the vested interests on a very large scale Lohia knew that both the private and the public sectors in India were diseasted. Neither nationalisation nor enhanced rate of income-tax could remove these crisis. Curb on expenditure is a more fundamental way of eliminating corruption, wastage and inequality.

Nehru's economic outlook was production-oriented. He vehemently represented what we called distributing of poverty. Any scheme of distribution must come later. Lohia and Gandhi laid stress on equality of consumption and envisaged an economy on its basis, without such a basc there can be another egalitarianism nor capital formation. He wanted to set up up a rigorous order of priorities for production, from foodgrains upwards to articles of consumption. Ceiling of both income and expenditure was the core of his economic plan.

Gandhi had tried to solve the problems of religion and caste from the point of view of equality of all religions and all castes. His personality was that of a Hindu Vaishnav and as such, he became the symbol of equality of all religions. It was another matter if he could not have the desired effect on Hindus and Muslims because of political exploitation of religious sentiments. Nevertheless, the secularism of today has been founded on that attitude of his. Lohia took it to its logical conclusion when he refused to acquire in the artificial division of the country on the basis of religious separatism. As for the castes, he formulated his theory of preferential opportunities for the backward and exploited castes so that they might achieve equality through the use of political and administrative power.

During the struggle for Independence Gandhi had realised that mental and cultural liberation was inseparable from political and economic emancipation. And so he fought for the liberation from the English language and its culture. He knew that it was not possible to make revolutionary progress in the political and economic spheres without intimate knowledge of the life of the people, without creative and dynamic use of their mental abilities.

An alien language is most unsuited for those purposes. After Gandhi's death mental slavery was on the increase, there was a new lease of life for the domination of the English language and consequently the mind of the nation became more imitative and fashion-oriented, incapable of knowing its own roots or creating anything new.

Lohia had to take up this burden too. He knew that no progress is feasible so long as the mind is caged. When he waged this struggle for the liberation of the mind he had to face opposition from all influential quarters which included men haloed by the freedom movement. Against the combined opposition of all vesred interests Lohia had to fight a struggle which was at times more bitter than that which Gandhi had to face. In this struggle for replacing English by Indian languages he not only held forth a Gandhian principle but was in actuality fighting the battle of equality for the millions.

Today we are confronted with a great task. India's freedom was truncated in every sense. When Gandhi died, India was in the midst of ominous possibilities. The leadership which took over the reigns of free India could not rise above narrow, personal interests and greed of power and prestige. They misdirected the nation's policies and degraded the fibres of the people. But we found in our midst a man who with indomitable courage and unbounding patience took up the whole nation's burden on his lonely shoulders. He could voice the suffering of a lone poor man as well as the aspirations of the whole of mankind and make them heard despite all kinds of obstruction and resistance. The masses got solace to hear that voice. Today our problem is how, under the inspiration of that voice, to march ahead along the road of fight against injustice and inequality.

48

LOHIA's IDEAS ON INDIAN ECONOMIC DEVELOPMENT

A. VASUDEVAN

Lohia advocated the replacement of capitalism by socialism in underdeveloped countries mainly because they do not have enough of productive equipment with which to produce and cannot afford either 'block use of science and heavy large-unit technics' or/and the inequalities in income distribution. Asia's teeming millions and equipment seem to be decisive factors in the scheme of industrialisation or agricultural reconstruction. He argued : "There is no sense in applying traditionally known science to agriculture or mechanizing it unless the area worked per person reaches a respectable size. An agricultural worker in India works around one and a half acres of land today. Any scheme to rationalize Indian agriculture, whether of the capitalist or the Communist variety, must provide at least six to ten acres of land to every agricultural worker."[1] He knew that this will mean 80-100 million agricultural workers in all will be unemployed. The solution for it consisted "in decentralised socialism with all its appropriate forms of small machines, co-operative labour, village government and so forth,"[2] rather than in capitalism and concentrated capital. In his view, in Europe and America, each man has tools and machines worth 1,000-2,000 dollars, while in India, each man has Rs. 150 worth to produce wealth. To get out of this trouble he thought that neither Western technology nor the inferior indigenous technology would be helpful. For spinning wheel by itself will not be a solution but

if it is run by electricity, it may well be. This did not mean that large scale industry should not exist, for steel works or river training projects are necessary. But Lohia emphasized small machine and 'technics.'[3] He argued that Is is not like *charkha* or a return to primitive tools and that he talked of a new machine. Such a small unit machine would be comprehensive, manageable and economical (in the sense that it will be born out of available savings). It would also be economically efficient, and rationalized with regard to the use of techniques, and mode of ownership. It would be run by electricity or oil : made available to every hamlet or town and would be built on the principle of immediacy of operation and output. It would be simple and also be an embodiment of the principle of decentralisation in space and time.

Lohia pleaded for eradication of private property, "exeept such as does not occassion employment of one by another." but as exclusive state control of property was disastrous both for bread and freedom. Villages and co-operatives, instead, could own property and not merely the Centre. Socialism did not mean to him mixed economy. Socialised ownership and control must exist and be as much decentralized as possible. He argued for internal equality, which did not mean either social security or full employment but a concrete concept where 'the proportion of lowest and highest incomes should not vary beyond the range of 1 to 10.' Equality did not mean fixed ration or quota of food, for food should be supplied according to one's hunger. But clothes and houses could well be provided equality. He thought that compulsion, persuasion and example could all be exercised to effect economic equality.

He had often given his programme (of the party) to the nation, He maintained that improvement in agriculture would be possible only by better irrigation, roads and manure and efficient organization of tools. He did not rule out major irrigation and river-training projects, but placed emphasis on minor irrigation particularly earthworks. Land reforms were also important : a family of five will be left with a maximum of three times unit of land that a family can cultivate without employing hired labour or mechanization[4]. Landless labourers or poor farmers will get some lands, as also co-operatives, placed under the village panchayat. He also felt that a Food Army of one million persons on one crore of acres could be brought forth, with a capital outlay

of Rs. 150 per acre and an annual working outlay of Rs. 1,000 each year for 2 years. The Food Army was expected to cost Rs. 250 crores in the first year, and Rs. 150 crores in the second year, while Rs. 50 crores might be kept for emergency purposes. At the end of two years, the Army will pay itself as additional cultivation will bring forward 4 million tons of food. And a major portion of this Army might later turn into model villages or co-operatives in cultivation. Lohia also pleaded for a balanced diet, replacement of land revenue by a graded agricultural income-tax and party between agricultural and industrial prices. Nationalization of all largescale industries, steel output of 4 million tons per annum, preparedness to allow all those industries which are small and decentralized to be run by co-operatives, income ceilings, and welfare measures like free medical care and primary education for children were advocated by him as necessary programmes of action by any socialist government. He thought that government should impose "a maximum on all incomes of rupees 2,000 per month in terms of present prices. Our income will be appropriately graded. The means followed will be of straight fixing."[5] But he was skeptical of the productive apparatus and aware of the fact that the "promise of a welfare state in advance of an investing state is a delusion."[6]

Indeed this emphasis on investment is remarkable, but is unfortunately often forgotten. His recent attacks on the high consumption standards of the urban elite and the ruling sections of the commnuity and his proposed for a ceiling on expenditure particularly in view of the conspicuous consumption of luxury items indicate really *not* his socialistic fervour, as many misunderstand, but essentially his grasp of the early process of development. If growth rate in economic terms has to be maximum, investments have to be built up, by first accumulating surpluses in agriculture and industry and by utilizing best the given and rising capital stock. It is here the advocacy of wider irrigation facilities and build-up of essential heavy industries and small machines become significantly pertinent.

One gets uncomfortable, however, when *balanced* regional development is suggested. Lohia's ideas here were sketchy and were largely promoted by political aims. In his view, the foreign aid dependence—devaluation of 1966 being regarded by him as Indian acquiescence to the rich American pressure—had killed the

morale and adversely affected the attitudes and abilities to work, which are an important non-economic factor of economic growth. To him, aid is an instrument of foreign policy and as such both the American and Soviet aid, have to be viewed on par. But he had not given in detail his views of the motivations and responses of private entrepreneurs; nor did he spell out the role of the market mechanism in future economic build-up. The case for bank-nationalization did win his sympathetic support but it is doubtful if he had taken it as a final solution. Very little light was also thrown on labour productivity *vis-a-vis* technological improvements that took place over the last decade or so in the industrial sector; his stress on employment-creation being in his last days largely watered down by negligence of indifference to pursue the idea of small machine. He showed his concern over population explosion and knew that its control cannot be rapid and easy. He regarded, indeed correctly, an investing state to be the first and foremost requisite for rapid economic development, and with this end in view, emphasized the development of agriculture as the first *source* of industrialisation.

Notes and References

1. Rammanohar Lohia : *Marx. Gandhi and Socialism*, 1963, pp. 305-05.
2 *Ibid.*
3. *Ibid.* p.ii of the Preface and p. 368.
4. *Ibid.* p. 402.
5. *Ibid.*, pp. 407-08.
6. *Ibid.*, p. 411.

49

RAMMANOHAR LOHIA—THE MAN OF UPRIGHT LIFE

BHOLA CHATTERJI

There was silence, eerie silence all-around. For a fleeting moment, just a tiny fraction of a moment the light flickered. It flickered long enough for a pale glow to light up every face that looked so intently at the man who was struggling for life. He wanted to live—and why not ? He had so much to do, his mission was so far from complete.

But no, a cruel fate had decided otherwise—the ailing man must live no longer. For him the night must end no more, another day shall never dawn. And Rammanohar Lohia, restless and rebellious while alive quit this wide wonderful world without heeding the entreaty of the many—

"rage, rage against the dying of the light".

What remains of him ? what continues ?—now that he has upto dust returned; the passion, fury and tumult he caused are all a thing of the past; the battles he lost and the laurels he won hurt nobody any more But that is a question, you will agree, not many would attempt to answer. Simple are the reasons. Rammanohar Lohia is still very much a living presence, his shadow yet hovers over the scene.

THE VALUES HE CHERISHED

Alive he ruled the hearts and minds of many, the record of the recent times would bear eloquent testimony to that. He inspired not a few to act when the going was rough, to rally when the rout seemed total, to get back repeatedly to the path of struggle, suffering and sacrifice. This is not all. He made the humble and the lowly scale heights that until then were the exclusive preserve of the privileged few.

As well may one repeat, is Lohia dead, spiritually (not in the vulgar sense of the term) that is. Do the values he cherished still have a meaningful message ? And what about his philosophy of "jail, spade and vote"? Or the dictum of "construction and satyagraha"? Does it make any sense in the changed context any more ? In other words, is Lohia still relevant ?

Which in turn leads to another, and more complex, question : what was the essential Lohia ? Was he a socialist philosopher who was also deeply aware of the need of socialism acquiring as Indian visage ? Or a radical nationalist whose anger against injustice and yearning for an egalitarian way of life would not allow him to confine himself to any given label for long ? Or an iconoclast for the mere pleasure of it ? Or a visionary born ahead of his time ? Or was he just a complex-ridden schemer, as some seem to assert, whose only ambition was to get to power and share it with none ?

That he was a socialist who firmly believed that socialism, if it were to lead the people to the upland of peace, progress and prosperity, needs must go native requires no repetition. But this alone is not enough for an understanding of the man that he was. Everything else apart, Lohia was a non-conformist; a reble who made rebellion against every form of injustice his one and the only religion. And it did not matter a wee bit whether the act of injustice was native or alien.

MAN HIS FINAL MEASURE

To him man was the measure of all things. Of the fact that ours is a world tired of man few had a deeper realisation than he. Who knew better than him that humanism, particularly in this part of the world, that dirty word, that it is taboo ? For we do

not do anything for man the individual, we act only when the multitude is involved. Since we are out of patience with his utterly inadequate industrial civilization and in a hurry to usher in the millennium, we just do not have the time to pause and worry about the individual. His problem and predicament are not very real to us, even though the world beyond these does not exist to him. Lohia of course thought otherwise. He never lost sight of the insignificant and the immediate even when the significant and the distant demanded his most devoted attention.

A democrat by conviction and not because of the circumstances as most of us are, socialism to him was basically a way of life. And it had to be lived at every level and always, and not restricted to the ceremonial and the demonstrative. Socialists would have to be, as Nath Pai so succinctly put it some time back "365-day socialists" and not just casual. He was convinced that the party of socialism must "build up an adequate doctrinal foundation of consistent logic that gives an autonomous direction in thought and action and save it from confusion that disperses and scatters." He did uot stop here. He was clear in his mind about the fact that it was a logical necessity for the socialist movement to have a distinct Indian character, to commit itself to "the principle of equal irrelevance of capitalism and communism in respect of the creation of a new human civilization." It must move still further, for it would have to "build a third camp that . . . does not prefer one to the other, holding the two equally good equally evil." So "a new human civilization" was the dream that Lohia dreamt. Here was the rub.

SOURCE OF STRENGTH AND WEAKNESS

It was not unoften that he found wanting the vehicle to carry his ideas into the realm of reality. Despite its apparently militant stance and over ones of aggressive radicalism, the party of socialism it matters little whether it was the Congress Socialism Party, Socialist Party, Praja Socialist Party, or Samyukta Socialist Party) was largely a party of the Westernised intellectuals. Thus essentially it was in favour of rationality, of a reasoned approach to men and things. Naturally, there, it was opposed to the irrational aspects of nationalism and the dogmas of Marxism. This was as much its source of strength as that of weakness.

Unlike most others he had a deep appreciation of this. Which in turn made him search furiously for ways to get round the hurdles. The many ideological innovations he hit upon were part of his prescripition for projecting a more acceptable image of the party and identifying it with the people.

So far so good. But at some point in time he became a little too impatient to continue his journey along the straight, hard road to power. And he started searching for short cuts that eventually led to the slippery slope of "all-inclusive non-Congressism," the supposed cure-all of every ailment the country suffered from. Since the Congress was the canker he would sup with tke devil and yet have no long spoon to get rid it. If this contradicted his earlier ideological formulations the explanation could be found in the compulsions of Indian politics. It was another matter if the explanation could not be extended to pass for justification.

And more. Rare was the occasion when he could be persuaded to agree that the other man also had a point of the view that deserved to be heard. When necessary, he could be harsh, both with the tongue and with the pen, to men and ideas. Charity at the political level he was incapabie of, although at any other level there was an abunndance of it. And he was relentless when it came to pursuing the man who dared to cross his path.

OBSESSIVE DESIRE FOR CHANGE

All this notwithstanding, he was, besides Jawharlal Nehru, the most dynamic person on the nation's political scene after freedom. His opposition to whatever demeans, debases and demoralises was complete. No man fought India's worst malaise —caste—so determinedly as he did. The art of compromise he did not have much use for and he was a non-conformist when society needed non-conformism most but had only contempt for it, when non-conformism meant excommunication from power and pelf. His desire for change, change that is total and unalloyed, wes on the verge of obsession. But, then, it was magnificent obsession. Above all, he breathed the Haldighati spirit when the world around plumped too easily for the Man Singh way.

Such a man you had better take as he was with all his warts and wrinkless. Then, and only then, you would get a glimpse of the man that he was : *Integer vite scelerisque purus*—the man of upright life, unstained by guilt.

50

LOHIA—AN AMERICAN RADICAL'S ESTIMATE

IAN MCMOHAN

I

On May 27, 1964, Jawaharlal Nehru, Prime Minister of India, died in New Delhi. The following day, Dr. Rammanohar Lohia, once one of Nehru's closest associates and later one of his most formidable opponents, was arrested when he declined to leave a Jackson Mississippi cafeteria without being served. This sequence of events was a coincidence, but an instructive one. It is quite possible that Lohia might have been Nehru's heir. were it not for the qualities that took him to that segregated cafeteria. He has never been able to moderate his hatred of and resistance to injustice for the sake of popularity or personal comfort.

Being arrested for protesting injustice is no novelty to Lohia. He spent a total of six years in British prisons during the fight for Indian independence, and has been arrested about twenty times by the British, Portuguese, Nepalese and Indian governments. He sometimes laughingly claims the title of world's champion political prisoner. More than this, Lohia and his associates have been almost alone in applying Gandhian principles of civil disobedience to correcting injustices in independent India. His emblems are the spade, the prison, and the ballot, symbolizing constructive work projects, civil disobedience, and electoral struggle against the *status quo*. He has maintained his devotion to all three.

Rammanohar Lohia was born in 1910 into a family of

Marwari background. The Marwaris are a linguistic group, many of whom became prominent merchants in the nineteenth and twentieth centuries. His mother died when he was quite young. After studying at the Universitites of Calcutta and Bombay, he took his Ph. D. at the University of Berlin in 1932. Shortly after his return to India, he plunged himself into independence movement.

In 1934, Lohia was one of the founders of the Congress Socialist Party, the left wing of the independence movement. His outstanding grasp of world affairs led to two years of service as Secretary of the Congress Party's Foreign Department, from 1936 to 1938. He continued to participate actively in civil disobedience, moving Gandhi to say in 1940, "I cannot sit when I see still Rammanohar Lohia and Jayaprakash Narayan in jail, than whom I do not know braver or straighter men."

With the outbreak of World war II, some Congress members felt that the indepenence movement should be subordinated to Britain's war effort. Lohia (and Gandhi) rejected this view, and in 1942 Lohia organized and led the underground struggle against British rule. This resulted in his imprisonment and torture by the British in the notorious Lahore Fort.

Immediately after the war, Nehru asked Lohia to become General Secretary of the Congress Party. He refused on grounds of political conscience. Instead, he, Jayaprakash Narayan and Asoka Mehta led the Socialists out of the Congress Party to become the chief opposition party. At about the same time, the freedom movements in Goa and Nepal came to Lohia. They had asked Congress to help them organize Gandhian civil disobedence campaigns, but the men who would imminently become the Indian government were too "responsible" to help them. Lohia was not, and he initiated the campaign which put the Nepalese Congress in power.

The peasant problem also occupied the Socialist Party. During the revolution, hundreds of thousands of peasants had non-violently occupied the land they had tilled for landlords. After independence the Congress government began dispossessing them and restoring the land to the landlords. The S.P. initiated mass protests against these dispossessions, culminating in a march on Delhi of tens of thousands (the *New York Times* reported seventy-five thousand) in June 1951, led by Lohia. In that same

year, Lohia founded the Asian Socialist Conference, which was for several years the largest organization of socialists in the world.

The first general election in Jannuary 1952 was a disappointment to many members of the Socialist Party. For the first time, the strangle hold of Congress on Indian politics was ravealed. The Praja Socialist Party received over three million votes, and elected only three members to the Lok Sabha (House of the People). This failure subjected the party to severe strains. Many members wanted either to form electoral alliances with Congress or to re-enter Congress. Lohia, as the chief spokesman for the group who wanted to maintain a socialist opposition, was under constant fire from the right wing of the party.

In 1954, Lohia was elected general secretary of the party. Late that year, while he was in prison for civil disobedience, police in Travancore-Cochin, where a Praja Socialist government was in power, opened fire on a crowd. Lohia had previously formulated a policy of opening fire only in cases of armed insurrection or murder, neither of which applied in this case. He sent a hasty, strongly-worded telegram to the Travancore-Cochin government, calling on them to adopt this policy and resign. His enemies in the party seized on this and accused him of dictatorial methods. After a bitter internal fight, Lohia and hundreds of his followers were expelled from the PSP in 1955. Out of these explusions came the Socialist Party, of which Lohia was elected Chairman in 1956.

The competition between the two Parties sersously affected the strength of both. Socialist votes were now divided, often making the election of a Congress or Communist candidate possible. The reactions of the two Parties to this situation were instructively different. Lohi's party contented seats only where it had strength, and worked to build a political base through work projects and civil disobedience campaigns. One measure of their success was Lohia's election to the Lok Sabha in 1963. Running from the Farrukhabad constituency, he outpolled his nearest rival, a prominent Congressman by over 57,000 votes.

The Praja Party, on the other hand, was geared to electoral success. It felt the loss of its safe seats" very heavily, and some of its leaders began casting about for new sources of votes. Some found them in alliances with Congress others struck bargains with

the Communists. As the political programme of the PSP as a whole moved to the right, the positions of its right wing, led by Asoka Mehta, became indistinguishable from those of the Congress Party. Finally, in 1963, the PSP was forced to expel Mehta after he accepted Nehru's offer of a seat on the State Planning Commission and the Indian delegation to the United Nations. After his expulsion, Mehta led a few hundred followers back into the Congress Party.

The expulsion of Mehta removed one of the chief road blocks to unity between the SP and PSP. Unity efforts had been made before; in 1957, J.P. Narayan had held a series of conversations with Lohia on the subject, and they seemed to have reached an agreement. However, Mehta and his group sabotaged the negotiations. As a result, Narayan resigned from the PSP and abandoned politics. In 1964 negotiations resumed and at the beginning of June the national committees of the two parties held a joint meeting and united to form the Samyukta Socialist Party. The first general convention of the new pary was scheduled for January 1965.

II

Politics in the underdeveloped countries tends to be a dialogue among the rising middle and capitalist classes, with interventions of varying effectiveness by the great feudal landlords. Only during times of crisis are the broad masses able to play any effective role in determining state policy. The factors that make this so—racial tribal, linguistic and caste divisions within the nation, widespread illiteracy, a preponderance of small isolated villages—are nowhere more prevalent than in India.

This does not mean that there is no political debate or dissension. Except where an authoritarian regime has suppressed viewpoints other than its own, advocates of the widest possible spectrum of political and quasi-political programmes are found, from statist intellectuals and ferociously *laissez-faire* small businessmen to tribal or religious mystics. The fact that political activity is not restrained by the involvement of broader sections of society gives it a surreal atmosphere in which the equivalent of a cocktail-party quarrel can have far reaching effects on organizations that supposedly represent tens of thousands of people.

Politics becomes a game, although admittedly for high stakes. It also becomes inbred; members of the same family may become equally prominent in opposing parties or may compete for prominence in the same party. The lack of responsibility to mass democratic organizations makes nepotism and graft easy and pervading.

Another confusing factor for the Western observer is that such political debates as take place often focus on surrogate issues. The terminology seems familiar, but the content may be quite different. An example is the current dispute in India over the question of an official language. This dispute arose now only because the Congress government stopped temporizing on the question after nearly twenty years. Any country as divided linguistically as is India must except this to be a potentially explosive issue, appealing as it does to the nationalist, or rather localist, feelings of the different linguistic groups. The problem is further complicated by the fact that both English and Hindi are associated in the south with imperialist domination. But one reason the explosive potential of this issue is being fulfilled in Indla is that the establishment of Hindi as the official language would give the Aryan Brahmins a virtual monopoly of the national civil service, one of the chief sources of jobs for middle-class intellectuals. If on the other hand, minority languages such as Tamil or Telugu were established in states where their speakers are a majority, it would create private job preserves for the middle class job hunters and politicians of that state, or more precisely, for such of them as speak the established language. Such a job preserve would be well worth fighting for, even if that fighting may literally tear the country apart.

The failure to involve in politics the great majority of the people, particularly in the countryside, gives rise to another phenomenon, political bossism. In India, bossism occasionally reaches heights before which a hardened member of the Tweed gang would blush with shame or envy The peasant's horizon extends as far as his farthest field, and his vote is cast as the most powerful village leader suggests. Party struggles do break out in the villages, and bloodshed is a common feature of elections, but the issues in these struggles are purely local and may have no relationship to the programmes of the parties on a state or national level. The dominant frature of village politics is the

"vote pool", built not on commitment to a party or programmes but on personal loyalty to or intimidation by a local leader. These vote pools are pyramided into state-wide machines, again on the basis of loyalty to the boss who is most effective in supplying jobs, political favours, and government development funds.

The village vote pools are a major source of the Congress Party's strength. They alone would be nearly sufficient to give Congress a majority in the Lok Sabha. As a result, Congress on a state and national level is in a real sense irresponsible, that is, free of the restraints a shiftihg electorate would impose. The state boss who keeps his village leaders contented can pronounce any policy he likes on the state level and in the All-India Congress. Factional alliances and even party allegiances can shift with bewildering speed, because they are essentially the concern of a handful of independent bosses. Even the national policy of the government may be only a distorted reflection of the political balance inside the All India Congress and bear little relevance to the real problems of the country.

Nehru was able to use his personal popularity and the mantle of leadership he inherited from Gandhi to hold back the power of the state bosses on a national level. As a result, the capital was far more "westernized" and responsive to pressures from the middle-class intellectuals than were the states. Towards the end of Nehru's life, however, the most powerful state bosses, including Lal Bahadur Shastri, then boss of Uttar Pradesh, formed a junta inside the All-India Congress. This janta was able to engineer the election of Kamraj, the boss of Tamilnad, to the Congress presidency over Morarji Desai. The junta is far more accessible to the demands and pressures of the national capitalist sector than was Nehru. Their victory over Menon and Malaviya, and Shastri's later accession to the premiership, are indications of a reaction against the statism of Nehru's administration, and under Shastri the government can be expected to make in roads into that legacy.

Progressive social change in India must begin in the cities. The peasant, uneducated uninformed, regimented by political machines, is incapable of playing a leading role. Political machines exist in the cities as well, but they are based on some degree of ideological or programmatic commitment. The greater extent of political awareness of the urban voter makes this

necessary, and to that extent forces the parties to be responsible to their followers. This in turn tends to further increase the political knowledge of the urban voter.

Furthermore, the urban worker has far greater political leverage than his peasant counterpart. His role in the economy is far more important, which augments his strike power; his physical nearness to the organs of government, to newspapers and to political activists makes his actions far more difficult to ignore. Thus, he is both more likely than the peasant to be aware of crucial political issues and more likely to be headed when he tries to affect their resolution. Once begun, his protests spread to the countryside, but the initiative rests with the city.

Lohia and the Socialist Party have had some notalble successes in the cities. In August 1963 the Socialist trade unions in Bombay called a one-day general strike to protest rising food prices. As the day approached, the Congress Party and its affiliated unions mounted in increasingly frantic campaign to head off the strike, which threatened to be a serious blow to the prestige of the government. The Communist unions ignored the strike call until the last minute, when the success of the protest seemed likely to undermine their position. The Bombay government went as far as arresting the most prominent Socialist trade union leaders. Despite these handicaps, over seven hundred thousand workers answered the strike call, effectively stopping the city in what headlines in the *Times of India* called the largest protest in the history of Bombay.

So far, however, the Socialists have not succeeded in translating the success of their direct action campaigns into electoral victories. The efficiency of the Congress machines in the villages is certainly one reason for this failure. Another lies in the inherent difficulties of elections by plurality when many splinter parties are running candidates. These difficulties have made it possible for Congress to maintain an over-whelming majority in the Lok Sabha even though it was able to gain a bare majority of the popular vote only in the last general election.

In addition, the Socialists' lack of electoral success has caused many potential members to see Congress as the only institution through which immediate gains can be won. They fail to understand that the drift to the right of the Congress Party is at least in part a result of their failure to help build an alternative on

the left.

Finally, the Socialist Party had a constitutional provision forbidding it to contest seats in districts where party membership was less than one per cent of the electorate. The motives for this provision were eminently democratic. But since the popularity and influence of the party extended far beyond its own ranks, this measure had a limiting effect on electoral activity.

III

Seventy million agricultural workers in India live on two cents a day. Over two hundred seventy million live on an average income of four cents a day. A street sweeper or even a primary school teacher may earn forty cents a day. Unless the implications of these statistics, in famine, squalor, disease and human misery, are understood, no comprehension of the real problems of a backward economy is possible.

The first priority must go to devising a programme to raise living standards to at least a subsistence level. So far, this has not been done. The gap between rich and poor must be narrowed. So far, this has not been done. The richest family in India has an income after taxes of twenty thousand dollars a day. When Lohia proposed a curb on spending of two hundred dollars a month per person, the excess to be reinvested, he was assailed as a maniac, even though such a measure would make as much as five billion dollars available for capital investment per year.

Western commentators sometimes pose the question : "The road to industrialization—China or India ?" They rejoice in the failure of the "Great Leap Forward' and point out that India's growth rate is three per cent, about the same as that of the United States. What they do not point out is that this figure, for the United States, represents a growth of about £ 95 per person, while for India it represents a little over £ 1 per person. In other words India is barely keeping ahead of its own population growth.

Moreover, the contrast between India and China extends only to methods of industrialization. Both countries are attempting to build large scale industrial plants on the American-Russian model. As Lohia has said, Henry Ford and Joseph Stalin would probably have understood each other very well for they were both pre-occupied by the same sorts of problems.

Opposition to massive industrialization has been almost the exclusive property of various Tolstoyan and pseudo-Gandhian anarchists who are incurably addicted to the pictures que and soul-building character of poverty. These thinkers speak intelligently on the need for community and overlook the need to avoid stravation.

For Lohia, the American and Russian models of industrialisation are equally irrelevant to the Indian situation. The density of its population, the backwardness of its agriculture and transportation, the scarcity of available capital, make some creative alternative to these models an absolute necessity. Capitalism in India has failed at the task it does best, creating capital. Indian capitalists are predominantly merchants, traders and middlemen. They are distributors, not producers, consumers, not investors.

The other major source of capital in an underdeveloped economy is the government. But as Lohia points out, at the rate of capital accumulation of the current five-year plan, India may attain the 1950 capitalization per capita of the United States in about one hundred years. The forced accumulation made possible by Communist totalitarianism might reduce this figure somewhat, perhaps to seventy five years. In either case, there is little reason to suppose that the vast social dislocations during the transition would permit the government programmes to continue uninterrupted. The contrast between modern industrial manufacture and highly primitive agriculture, and between the living standards of the groups engaged in; each, might well lead to Luddite outbreaks of machine wrecking, or to such domestic unrest that the economy would be disrupted. The fluctuations of the world market, and the inherent disadvantage of primary producers within the market, would also impose limitations on capital growth programmes. The under-developed countries are tortoises competing with Achilles, but in this race it is Achilles who has the head start.

Thus, even if large-scale industrialization on the American-Russian model is the most desirable course, it is only minimally possible and then at a cost of untold suffering for the great majority of the people. But there are grounds for doubt that it is even the most desirable course. An underdeveloped country cannot hope to compete with the advanced industrial countries in the field of basic manufacturing, such as steel, autos, aircraft, and machine tools. Their industry must be directed primarily at a domestic market and geared to the needs of that market. The folly of any

other course is nowhere better revealed than in the phenomenon of the heavily-subsidized stateowned airlines which fly nothing but the latest jet equipment while the people of the country travel on foot, by cart, or at best on antiquated railroads.

As an alternative to large-scale industrialization, Lohia proposes a programme based on the principles of decentralization, democratization and the small-unit machine. The first two principles are parallel to the conceptions of European and American socialists, but the concept of the small-unit machine runs directly counter to traditional socialist assumptions, which accept the necessity of the factory system and even see it as progressive.

The small-unit machine is visualized as a modern analogue of the hand-loom of the Gandhian movement. It would apply the latest advancements of technology and would no doubt call forth new developments to suil its special requirements. Powered by gasoline or electricity, the small-unit machine would require a work force of up to ten or twenty and would depend on local sources of raw materials. Some possible examples that come to mind include a combined gin, spinneret and power loom, a very lightweight water pump, a small blast furnace and foundry, a sawmill, combined grain mill and bakery, and a village-sized nitrate fertilizer plant.

Industrialization by means of the small-unit machine would have several advantages. It would allow industry to be taken to the villages rather than villagers to the industry, making the massive social dislocation of industrialization unnecessary. It would provide more jobs per unit of capital investment, an important consideration in an economy of chronic underemployment. It would also serve the ideological or social aims of decentralization and democratization in a way that large-scale industry cannot.

A thorough-going programme of land reform would also advance these aims, as well as easing the burden of capital savings. The peasent cannot be persuaded to improve his farming methods if the increased yield enriches his landlord. Division of the land is thus, paradoxically, the road to modernization in agriculture. It would both raise the abysmals living standard of the villages and provide an additional source of capital. Furthermore, the plan which such a programme would instill in the villager would itself be a source of capital improvements. If, for example, one-quarter of the Indian peasant were to volunteer two hours a week to constructive work projects such as digging irrigation ditches and building

schools, millions of dollars in capital investment would be created at little or no cost to the national plan.

Ownership of the small-unit machines would be decentralized. While large-scale industry such as railroads would be nationalized the small-unit machines could be owned by state and village governments as well as by producers' and peasants' co-operatives. In this way, the people would gain a much closer relationship to their tools of production and increased control over the forces that dominate their lives.

This decentralization of economic power would be coupled to decentralization of political power. Within the limitations imposed by nationhood, decisions would be made on the lowest political level. For example, the curriculum of public schools would be determined broadly on the national level, but variations to allow for cultural and linguistic difference would be determined on the state and village level.

The effect of decentralization would be to make the content of democracy much greater. The political bossism endemic in the Indian villages today could not survive if the villagers were able materially to affect their own lives through the voting process It is the very remoteness from their lives of the decisions they are called on to make that breeds voter apathy and bossism.

Lohia's domestic programme is not the answer to every problem that confronts an underdeveloped country. It is an approach to an answer, a direction pointed out, a set of principles. Capitalism has been unable to feed India. Communism would take away the few liberties that exist and still be unable to feed India. Both are irrelevant to the quest for bread and freedom. Lohia's ideas indicate the way toward a social order that could provide both.

IV

Any political programme for the underdeveloped countries must at some point come to grips with the overriding international problem of our time, the cold war. The cold war has an effect on almost every political issue in every country in the world, from the curriculum of a California university to the standard of living on Guam. The permeating influence of the cold war has come close to making the distinction between domestic and foreign policy

obsolete, because any programme of domestic reform may at any point be frustrated because of a change in the course of relations between the two cold war blocs. In this situation, a political programme which does not purpose an effective policy for dealing with the cold war is little short of Utopian.

There are three common responses to the cold war found in governments, political parties, and individuals alike. The first is support of the western bloc. This support may on all levels be coupled with the most violent criticism of this or that policy of individual countries in the bloc. It is often justified more on the basis of the evils of Communism than on the blessings of capitalism, especially in the former colonial countries who have excellent memories of the blessings imposed on them by capitalism. However, in any confrontation between the two blocs, some rationale is invariably found for defending Western policy.

The second very common response to the cold war is a distorted mirror image of the first, namely, support of the Communist bloc. Here too, the basic orientation may be disguised by serious criticisms of the 'excesses" in the Communist bloc; indeed, many of the individuals with this response could reasonably expect to fall victim to such excesses if they lived within the bloc. Support of the Russian bloc is often justified in terms of its alleged economic democracy or historical inevitability rather than of the realities of its social system. But again, in any confrontation a rationale for defending Communist policy is found.

The third response is that of the neutralists, of whom Nehru was a natural leader. These people and governments decline to identify themselves completely with either bloc. There are certain economic advantages to be gained from the ability to play the two blocs against each other, but ideological factors are also involved. Many of the neutralists have a deep and sincere belief that the cold war is a war against all humanity and that not much can be expected from either side. But they have failed to go beyond this belief to a positive programme. In its absence, they sway in the winds of social change, now to the East, now to the West, hoping to avoid falling to the one or the other.

This weak neutralism, which plays servant to both blocs and is respected by neither, was a hallmark of Nehru's India. As Lohia puts it :

"The grand design of a free India away from the two camps of the Atlantics and Soviets and acting as the nucleus of creative strength for a new world has been dissipated in a welter of clever words. When there is no base of economic and military strength, only those words have power which well up from the heart. India's foreign ministry has known how to speak clever words, but not true words. I did not speak true words on defeated Germany and Japan, on China and Tibet, on Kenya, Egypt, Hungary, Algeria and Israel, on disarmament, nuclear or unilateral. . . Its attitude to Anglo-America has been one of oral disharmony but material compliance, to Soviet Russia that of material disharmony but oral compliance, while a purposeful approach to both America and Russia would have been based realistically, frankly, and harmoniously on India's estimate of her needs and the world's.

"India has never really been non-aligned. She has merely been playing a great power game with chips of no value and calling the clever alternation of her favours and services, between the Atlantics and the Soviets, non-alignment. The India government in fact divided itself into two wings, one that aligned with the Soviets and the other with the Atlantics, in the hope that alignment in two different directions would result in non-alignment."

There is some doubt whether non-alignment of the sort the Indian government professes is possible as a stable and continuos policy. The developing countries, with a few exceptions like China and Korea, and one or two possible exceptions like Indonesia, are building their economies on the model and within the world economic system of the Western bloc. Ties and trade, capital investment, and the culture and interests of their dominant classes bind them to the West. Any evolutionary development appears to lead inevitably toward a strengthening of these ties. So far no country has become Communist through a process of evolution; this social system, with its attendant alliances; has come into being only as the result of direct revolutionary changes, whether by popular revolt or foreign occupation. This fact suggests two possible futures for a non-aligned, underdeveloped country : if it achieves internal stability, it will eventually drift into the Western camp; if it fails to achieve stability, the government will eventually

be overthrown and replaced by one that will take it into the Communist camp.

For those who are concerned about the future of world peace and human freedom, this suggests a bleak picture out of 1984, a world split into two opposing armed camps in which human goals will be sacrificed to the exigencies of the cold war effort. There is, however, an alternative to this picture which offers the possibility of peaceful and democratic development. The alternative is the Third Camp.

The concept of the Third Camp was formulated in world socialist circles during the late 1930's when the final degeneration the Russian Revolution and the menace of the approaching world war made a new policy imperative. Lohia and his comrades, organized at that time as the Congress Socialist Party, used the term to express their feeling that the Indian independence movement should neither take sides in the war nor allow it to deter them from their struggle. Their aim instead was to help create a Third Camp, independent of the warring Allies and Axis, and built around popular movements for national independence and those elements in the warring countries which supported the primary objectives of peace, democracy and colonial freedom.

with the end of World War II, the configurations of the world power struggle changed. The cold war between the Western and Russian blocs began. But for the adherents of the Third Camp, this did not effectively alter the situation. Neither bloc appeared to be concerned primarily with democratic social change, nor with any thing other than the aggrandizement of its own power. Among the staunchest members of the Western bloc were the very imperial overlords against whom the colonial peoples were struggling the Russian bloc promised to spread the same oppression to which it was then subjecting Western Europe. Moreover, both blocs threatened the world with the massive destruction of an atomic war. The movements for peace and freedom had nothing to gain and everything to lose by associating themselves with either bloc. Only a third Camp could further their interests.

The twenty years since the end of World, War It have borne out this analysis. The United States has taken up the task of defending capitalism throughout the world against the dynamic force of Communist dictatorship. But because the United States is committed to the defence of capitalism, it has no positive

alternative to offer to the Communist programme. Instead, it relies on those elements in the underdeveloped world who are most trustworthy from its point of view, that is, the military, the feudal landlords, and the government bureaucrats. American policy is to oppose all progressive movements on the grounds that they might lead to Communism. In fact, however, as the experience of Cuba and Vietnam has demonstrated, this opposition is far more likely to encourage the growth of Communism. The only viable alternative to Communism is a revolutionary democratic social movement which can carry out land reforms and other measures to eliminate the problems on which Communist demagoguery feeds.

The Communist bloc to has shown itself to be opposed to genuine steps toward peace and freedom. Its policies have been dicated, not by the interests of the peoples of the underdeveloped countries, but by the needs of the Russian government. The growing dispute between the Russian and Chinese parties has not altered this situation. For example, the Japanese Communist Party, which is dominated by pro-Chinese elements, is no more revolutionary toward the Japanese government than is the Moscow-oriented Italian party toward the Italian government. The foreign policy of China is based on anti-Americanism, so the JCP diverts its energies into anti-American campaigns rather than trying to deal with the problems of the Japanese workers it pretends to speak for.

At first, immediately before and after Indian independence, Lohia expected a Third Camp to emerge at any moment. India, starting nationhood with no foreign entanglements and with the heritage of Gandhism, seemed its natural power base. Regimes in Burma and Indo-China were friendly and receptive. The European socialists, who at that point appeared to be very close to taking power, seemingly endorsed the concept. National independence struggles were beginning to break out in the colonial countries of Latin America, Africa, and Asia. Could not these forces, with the support of the workers' movements in England, the United States and even, in time, Russia remold the entire world ?

Disillusionment came quickly. Almost he first act of the Congress Government was to recognize a state of war between India and Japan as a concession to Great Britain. The popular movements in Italy and France were betrayed by the Communists, stifled by the Social Democrats, and intimidated by the American

occupation troops. In the United States, the post-war upsurge in the CIO failed to lead to the establishment of mass labour party. The French, with the co-operation of Britain, the United States, and Russia, reoccupied Indo-China and drove the popular Government underground. The Labour government in Britain suppressed freedom movements in its African colonies. The national liberation movements that were not crushed outright were far too concerned with the bitter struggles in their own countries to consider the wider implications of those struggles. By 1949, the post-war revolutionary wave had peaked and ebbed away, leaving in its place the artificial stability of the cold war.

In the succeeding fifteen years, the great majority of colonies have gained their independence. The course of development which Third Camp socialists predicted has not in general been followed. The newly free countries of Africa and Asia are anti-imperialist, but they express this through more or less pliant neutralism while constructing various degrees of authoritarian regimes internally.

Twice in those fifteen years, it seemed that the Third Camp would emerge as a major force in world politics, once in 1956, during the brief glory of the Hungarian Revolution, and again in 1959, before the degeneration of the Cuban Revolution became apparent. In neither case was the hope for a Third Camp fulfilled, for a whole complex of reasons.

In another sense, however, the predictions of Third Camp socialists have been fulfilled all too accurately. Immediately after World War II, many people believed that the imperial peace laid down at Yalta; the forerunner of "peaceful co-existence," would make any third alternative superfluous. The warnings of Third Camp adherents that conflict between the American and Russian blocs was inevitable were brushed aside as the mutterings of so many Cassandras. In reality, however, these warnings were understand.

In particular, the Third Camp movement underestimated the effect of the coming cold war on its own followers. There was no precedent from which to judge the continuous strain of holding a position independent of, and under attack from, the two great power blocs. Under this strain many prominent figures, in India and thoughout the world, came finally to see hope in the victory and eventual reform from within of the one or the other bloc, while others took refuge in neutralism or abandoned politics

altogether.

It cannot be denied that these defection hurt the movement. But its basic strength lies not in this or that charismatic leader, but in the vitality of its ideas. This vitality is such that the ideologists of both the capitalist and Communist blocs feel obliged to answer the criticism of a group that controls not a single government on earth. Moscow and Peking point out that this group opposes the peace-loving people's republics, and hence must be friends of the Western warmongers; Washington does its best to convince the world that any form of socialisms at best a weak sister to Communism. On an intellectual level, each side propounds subtle and sophisticated arguments to demonstrate that is victory is inevitable and right, that a Third Camp could serve no useful function, and that in any case no Third Camp is possible.

Still, no idea, however logical and appearing, can by itself change the course of work history. It must contain a method for achieving concrete and objective power, based on demonstrable propositions about the nature power. For the Third Camp, the roots of power are in revolutionary democratic mass movements. No cabal, no attempt to get the ear those in power, can replace the self-organisation of the people for their own aims. The power of the Hungarian Revolution did not took in Hungary's relatively negligible military as industrial might; it lay in the mass soliders which paralyzed industry in a general strike few weeks after the blood bath of Budapest and the irresistible ideas which gave new hope people and stirred up unrest throughout the Russian empire. The Cuban Revolution was a real danger to American interests because, as long as it appeared to be democratic, it threatened to inspire the peoples of other Latin American countries to follow its examples.

The Third Camp is viable because it cannot be contained. A single victory anywhere in the world would set up reverberations wherever people long for peace and freedom. Because it represents the natural aspirations of the great majority of people everywhere, it cannot be permanently crushed, despite constant setbacks. Its victory is not inevitable; Marxists have formulated the alternatives before the world as socialism or barbarism, and the forces of barbarism have never seemed stonger. But, the victory of the Third Camp is the only human outcome possible in the current crisis of world history.

Lohia and his fellow Third Camp socialists throughout the world are like farmers who plough and sow a field, not knowing when the harvest will come, nor who will reap it nor even if it will survive the threatening storm. Their work is difficult, discouraging, and dispiriting; but perhaps it is the only work left that deserves the name human.

51

MYSTERY OF RAMMANOHAR LOHIA

K.G. RAMAKRISHNAN

"I am maligned."

Dr. Lohia, I am convinced, was not facetious when he gave out this lament in the Lok Sabba.

The irony of sarcasm, such as it was, lay in the situation. He was, perhaps, less or little to blame.

It was in a sense a moment of acute discomfiture for Dr. Lohia, it was a moment of utter defeat, complete rout. The climax saw him clearly on the losing side. He was, in fact, crestfallen.

In fact—that was the crux of the situation. *Not in appearance*, as it *appeared*.

Dr. Lohia's handicap is that he just cannot help his appearance. This is as true physically as in any other sense.

Even in sadness, he looks playful; in agony. frolicsome; in earnestness, ribald.

If Dr. Lohia had a God and had a wish, It would be to wipe the selfishness from his face, the smile from his eyes, and the mirth from his lips.

I have a feeling, Dr. Lohia has seldom looked himself in a mirror—and I don't mean it figuratively either. He is, I suspect, very unaware of how much harm that face of his has done to him—at least in the kind of middle class society whereby Parliament is environed.

It is a face that may or may not launch a thousand ships. But

it certainly is not a face that enables him to be taken seriously.

"I am maligned." It was, I am convinced, a heart-rending cry, full of poignant feeling. Yet, the response could hardly have been different, if he had sung a ribald tune. I was not present in the galleries when he spoke from the pit. But, I am almost sure that there was an outburst of laughter.

There, perhaps, was no malignity in that laughter. There, possibly, could have been a little disbelief. But there, certainly was a pat on his back, an approval of a humour that just was not meant.

Dr. Lohia gave out a sound; the domed hall echoed; but it was an echo different from what the Doctor had hoped for.

That, is short, is Dr. Lohia's tragedy. When he seeks sympathy, he gets an applause.

And worse. Where he raises an issue, he is taken to raise a scandal. And where he exposes a scandal, he is taken to murder innocence.

Dr. Lohia, without doubt, is a much maligned man. Has this made him bitter ?

It was past six one evening when I saw him at his house last week. It was not yet twilight. In could not yet be when you see this uniquely robust man.

I was surprised (I can not say pleasantly or otherwise) to find his house furnished at all; in any ease I was unprepared to find so many chairs around, not uncomfortable either. I meant to ask him about this but was soon too lost in the man to brother about trivia.

Yet, has not Dr. Lohia led me at least to expect that he would live very sparsaly ? Why did I get that feeling, when, in fact I should have expected him to be logical, and reasonable—which was all that the furnishing was, nothing lavish or elaborate but just enough to sit, talk, work or sip a cup of tea ?

Here, again, is the deep maligning of the man. He has preached against ostentation; but I had mistaken him to preach against reasonable living.

The man clearly is intense; but he succeeds only in seeming to be extreme.

Has not all this made him bitter ? I did not have to ask him. He was forthcoming himself. He stated the maligning merely as a fact. If he had a tear for this, that was not shed at least not in my

presence. He seemed to think that it was just not worth bothering oneself about. Fifteen years ago, he was taken even less seriously than he is now. And fiften years later, he would be taken even more seriously than now. Fifteen years ? Oh, that is only a manner of speaking, it will be much sooner than that !

It is this sureness, this optimism that carries him along. He is less assailed by doubt than most people, not because he is obstinate, but because he, perhaps, feels it is worthless to be arguing all the time, I was vaguely reminded of what Lenin is credited with saying : "If you all the time see the other point of view, you will have little time seeing your own."

Dr. Lohia is filled with a strange, almost frightening, sense of purpose, sense of mission. I am not entirely free of a fear that this may not lead, if it has not already led, to kind of magalomania that makes fascists of democrats.

Dr. Lohia is not a conscious fascist, at least I don't think he is. But, he may be unwittingly becoming one. The adualation that his followers shower on him is maddening. Within the SSP, there are dissidents. I can never associate Sri Madhu Limaye or Sri George Fernandes with hero-worshipping. But in any confrontation, Dr. Lohia will win hands down. The Doctor may not be aware of it but he a like a Fuehrer to his admiring crowd.

There is another danger signal. While I was talking to him, I mentioned where his partymen, now Ministers, might fail. Pat came the reply, "Oh, I can always carry the people with me." He elaborated by saying that he could address a quarter million people and the Ministers would know that they could stray from the path only at their peril.

All that he he meant to say was that the sanction would come from the people. But, the manner of his saying filled me with a nameless fear at that moment. Later this fear acquired a name—the incipience of fascism.

A further danger arises from his contempt of all kinds of people. He regards the Communists in as much derision as he regarded Nehru, and he regarded Nehru in as much condescension as he would regard Nath Pai. I am not here concerned with the rationale; some or all of us may share some or all his opinions on this or the other. But, the contempt so evenly banded out, leads to righteousness and righteousness is the germ of a fast spreading fascism.

Not that Dr. Lohia cannot distinguish and characterises; I am sure he has a reasonable assesment of Nehru's role, as he has of the Communist position. The trouble lies in his instinct, weird and uncanny, to spot the essential weakness of the other party or individual. Having spotted the weakness, he wages a relentless attack, and in so waging, acquires an unintended (and motiveless) malignity.

Certainly, the weakness, such as it is, has to be exposed; certainly the attack must be launched. But, the objective, or rather, the relative situation must not be ignored. That is, in Nehru's time, I would have thought that Dr. Lohia's job was to redeem him from his gloss. The destruction of Nehru was not as necessary as the destruction of his shibboleth. Similarly in our time Dr. Lohia, without becoming a Communist, can redeem the Communist movement from whatever opportunisms it has acquired.

I, for one, am one with the Doctor in most of his criticism of Nehru and the Communists, particularly the Dange Communists as calls them. (The other group, in Dr. Lohia's term, is the Gopalan Communists). But, I just cannot accept the craze to deny Nehru his place (and a pre-eminent place) in the Indian struggle nor can I acquiesce in the denial of a vangurd position for the Communist movement in the culminating battle for Indian socialism.

History, Dr. Lohia should not seek to unwrite. With all his weakness, Nehru was the main instrument for the spread of the Socialist idea. His own might have been vague, fashionable and aristocratic. But he represented of kindled the Socialist urge more the most people in India. And, despite the glorious but brief existence of the Congress Socialist Party, the real role of organising the Socialist movement must, without question, belong to the Communist Party. This party and its workers have gone through every type of ordeal and just when the efforts seem to lead to something positive. Dr. Lohia cannot, in all conscience, deny this party its historical role.

Not for this alone. For a different reason too. If Dr. Lohia is unable, both tactically and sincerely, to fit Nehru or the Communists into his socialist strategy, the result is very likely to be deepening self-importance.

I am more concerned than even Dr. Lohia that he should liberate himself from this unnecessary shackle. For he is not a

fascist, and would hold himself back if he know he was becoming one. With all his individualism, he has a democratic sense. He believes in mass action, not in the action of an organised brigade. He does rouse emotions, he appeals to reason.

Therefore, Dr. Lohia should take hold of himself before events take hold of him.

I shared with him my own misgiving about the Communist Party. He took me by surprise by saying that he, for one, would not be averse to dissolving the SSP and merging with the Communists, for he was sure the SSP idea would prevail. This was, of course, just a way of speaking, not a serious suggestion. I pressed on though, asking if the CPI did not have a vested interest in its identity. He merely shrugged his shoulders.

I am referring to this to emphasise that the Doctor should be taken into confidence. If he is feared for his intractable individualism, he should also be respected for his continuous search for the way out.

The remedy, as I can see it, is in criticising not Dr. Lohia's imagined antics (this is maligning) but his ideas (this is meaningful dialogue). In the process, the Communists, for instance, would soon find that they have as much to learn from the Doctor as he has to learn from them. This is the only way of consolidating socialist unity.

For Dr. Lohia is pre-eminently a socialist in its completest sense. In a land that abounds in all types of Socialism ranging from Gandhian to democratic, Dr. Lohia is among those who steadfastly clings to the only socialism that is true. He does not reject the class theory nor does he advocate class collaboration.

Where Dr. Lohia scorer over the Communists is in giving the Western concept an Indian articulation well within the frame work of the concept itself. His imagery is eminently Indian and that is why he is very likely to succeed. His raising the Lok Sabha debate on three *annas* and fifteen *annas* has done more to clarify issues than volumes of dialectical dissertation.

Dr. Lohia is a great clarifier. More than Commnnists he understands the need not to get entangled in the assumed virtues of the democracy that is India. The Communists have often defended concepts. Dr. Lohia seeks to destroy them. In doing this he appears to be destructive whereas the Communists have

temporarily at least wanted to be known as constructive.

Here is the crux or Dr. Lohia. His understanding of the vice of Indian multiclass democracy, is greater than the CPI's. The CPI must come to terms with him on this at least.

The Doctor is one of the earliest to understand the dangerous ascendancy, under Nehru's patronage, of the concepts over the people. It is this ascendancy that the Constitution sanctifies. This elite structure built by Nehru must be destroyed and destroyed ruthlessly. Concepts like administrative independence, judicial exclusiveness, audit impartiality, integrity of defence, national secularism, central overlordship and Presidential immunity are only aids to elite construction. So is the entire concept of Parliamentary democracy and the structure of Parliamentary privilges. Where as the former creates practical ways of non-accountable, extra-Parliamentary government enshrining the privilege of the elite in the name of "eminent" principle, the latter denies the sovereignty of the people by the creation of a lobby called Parliament, which perpetuates the rule over the people by acquiring special privileges in the name of immunity. Destory the former, you redeem the latter. If Parliament should really be the forum of people's sovereignty, then you should destroy the concepts that imprison Parliament; you should destory the class that creates the lobby.

Dr. Lohia has no time to formulate his ideas. That is his weakness. He goes directly into action. He thereby rouses misunderstanding. But, he is unafraid of middle class prudery. He thinks this class will rally round, when it necessarily has to shed its visions.

"Defunk"—that is Dr. Lohia's slogan, and rightly too.

In this process of defunking, he thinks the biggest step is to defunk the Congress which he calls the incubus. The defunking of the Congress will stir new thinking and in that new thinking will arise the scope for further and speedier socialist clarification. Where others are trammelled by fears that the destruction of the Congress might generate all kinds of forces, he sits like a Chinese Buddha, unmoved by fears, and to bored to explain.

It this non-relation of his actions to his rationale that makes him look perverse.

A few days ago in a private conversation someone remarked that Dr. Lohia was a crank. I intervened to say he was logical.

Another said, "Logical yes, but perversely so."

Dr. Lohia is neither perverse nor belongs to the lunatic fringe. But since he has never bothered to explain his reasons and is content only to act on his logic, he is misunderstood. Hence his lament, "I am maligned."

Take for instance his theory on modernised consumption. Modernised production, yes, but why this modernised consumption in the intermediate stage of development he asks. Till he explained to me, I thought his objection to cars, refrigerators and the like very perverse. His point is that automobile production must in the first instance be for impersonal use either as buses, trucks and jeeps or as cars for use offices or as taxis. His view is that the expenditures in the cities are so high that our productive wealth creates yawning gaps in relative prosperity. If you cut off the channels of modernised consumption, there is a greater realism in the savings movement, greater meaning in modernised production and greater assurance of distributive justice. In the absence of this explanation, I used to be disgusted with what appeared to be illogical puritanism and also suspected his motives when he objected to the small car project. I wondered if he supported the Birla monopoly. I am sure his answer would be, "Take over the Hindustan Motors and concentrate on production of public Vehicles."

Dr. Lohia's pet theory is that apart from the monoplists, the urban upper middle class was the greatest beneficiary of Nehru socialism. Since so much was done, Nehru was their darling.

"What then have you done to educate this decadent intelligentsia ?" I asked him. He smiled. "Do I have to educate them", he seemed to say. His point was that the impact of events would liberate them from their selfishness and prudery. He is in no sense angry with this class.

As he was saying this I was reminded of an account given to me by a Bombay journalist of a news conference in 1949 called by Dr. Lohia. The Doctor was in the United States when Nehru had gone there on his controversial trip. Nehru's theme was to denounce the U.S. policy of military blocs and to explain Indian non-alignment. Yet all that the Doctor had to tell the Bombay newsmen was that Nehru attended the Washington dinner in a strict three piece western suit !

The journalist was outraged. Is this all Dr. Lohia's politics ?

Yes, that is all his politics. And how much, that is ! Eighteen years later, the Doctor returns to the same thing—the mink coat and the diamond necklace. The essence of his argument, which, he ruefully remarked to me, was lost in newspaper sensationalism was that, corruption or no, dazzling brilliance goes ill with Indian drudgery.

In that single act of a three piece suit, Nehru almost lost his credential to speak for India. That was Dr. Lohia's point. You may not agree with this. But, a Gandhi might.

Whether this in itself was significant or not, the years since 1949 established the aristocratic ostentation of the Nehru era. Why Teen Murthi House ? Why, indeed, 25,000 rupees a day ? Not that Dr. Lohia was cavilling at Nehru's comfort or security. But he had to say that within limits, it was estimable; beyond limits it was vulgar.

I asked him if, even so, it was really necessary to do so much as to create the impression that he was obsessed with the Nehru family. He burst out "Do you think I should be obsessed with any other. I spoke against Nehru because he was Prime Minister and I speak against his daughter because she is Prime Minister. It is not my fault that they lead the Congress Party".

Then, he said, he would give up all this so-called baiting but on one condition. Let Smt. Gandhi give him something in return. Let her promise him that the Congress Party would undertake one demonstrable action of socialism. This, I thought was a fair offer.

Here, indeed, is a strange man, seemingly contrary and contradictory, apparently vengeful, yet in fact consistent, benevolent and well-meaning, He is adored by his followers, feared by those whom he exposes, hated by some and loved by few. Here is a greatly accomplished man, a linguist, one who can adorn any table with his sparkling wit, uninhibited ribaldry and the liveliest retort; who is at home in any company, yet roaming this country, a lonely man whom few understand and most mistrust.

It is time that before others provide the rationlisation, he does a little introspection. If he is not malevolent in raising the issue of mink coat and diamond necklace, he is very probably not chauvinistic in talking of Mansarovar or pro-American in appearing condone the massacre on the Mekong. I had but a brief meeting with him. I had meant to talk to him about his total view of future action, about how he thinks the Congress will evolve,

about his economic concepts, about his Hindi and national languages policy, about the American imperialist posture, about his ideas on bringing about action unity of the left, his attitude to the Jan Sangh and the P.S.P., etc.

I could not because there was not much time. I have a lingering hope that either his explanations will convince me or he will be prepared to reconsider his position.

In any case he has seriously got to reckon with various misgivings others have about his views and stances. Why does his logicality appear illogical ? Why does his democracy evoke fears of arbitrary authoritarianism ? If he chooses to ignore misgivings and suspicions of others, he likely to swell in self-importance. Ultimately he may stir a lot; achieve little; and his own basic ideas, instead of flowering into a new deal for the dispossessed millions, might degenerate into an expression of individual authotarianism.

Rammanohar Lohia, the stormy petrel of Indian politics, is nothing if he is not controversial. He has made and unmade parties. There is neither madness in his method nor whimsicality in his mood. If necessary he will make and unmake them again. His approach to the Mandal case in the Bihar Ministry establishes him as a constant fighter for his principles. The S.S.P's position in the Bihar Ministry is the same as C.P.I's in Bihar as well as U.P.

I asked him what distinguishes the conglomerate coalitions from the conglomerate Congress. He replied that the Congress was a conglomeration of individuals; the coalitions were a conglomeration of parties. The Congress degenerated because the individuals fought for their interest The parties of the coalition would fight on policy, expose one another and people would know who is their defender.

Dr. Lohia was, therefore, unafraid of the break up of the coalitions. If they broke up, the Socialist parties would come back with greater power. The Congress is living in a fool's paradise, if it thinks it can exploit coalition differences.

His optimism, his logic and his agility and asset to the Socialist movement. He must, of course, do a little adjustment. But one quality is basic to him. That is a total distaste of prudery.

Sometime back a Communist friend told me of how he learnt

cooking from another communist in the underground days. A Ramamurthi would know the price of brinjals. A Dange would know. An A.K. Gopalan would know. But would Professor Hiren Muherjee know ?

The Professor is not less of a Socialist. There is still difference. His refinement robs his socialist fervour of the coarseness of elemental rage. There is something to be said for a conscious abnegation of values, however unexceptionable, which create a wall between the elite and the people. It is for the Professor to consider what it was that impelled him to protest when Dr. Lohia called Sri Chagla a liar and went on calling him so. Is it that the allegation was false or is it that his finer sense was offended ?

Too often and readily have Communists become gentlemen. Let us, for God's sake, be ruffians. And it is this stand, a stand that makes for Raj Narains, that fascinates me most in D. Lohia.

I have no doubt that if Dr. Lohia had anything to do with Government of India, he would forthwith abolish the system of guard of honours. For the very idea of a man receiving the salute is anathema to him. Others will rationalise that this is necessary both for form and for military discipline. Dr. Lohia will reject form and organise discipline differently on the basis of human dignity.

I have no doubt that Dr. Lohia will encourage Ministers to go in a bus where they do their private work. Not that the Treasury could not afford the extra spending. But there is a basic approach, a constant corelation of men and matters to the common people.

In this there is a Gandhi in Dr. Lohia. A friend of mine recently reminiscing on the Spanish civil war, remembered the old man, who had just been told of the maiming of his only son, looking out of the window, seeing Madrid aflame and quietly murmuring, "All this cannot be for nothing. Something must emerge. The age of fundamentals is coming".

That was a hope. That age is yet to come. Men like Dr. Lohia belong to that age. He is a fundamental man.

Yet he is so much out of place. That was why he failed to convince when he said, "I am maligned". Smt. Gandhi had done her bit; he had been called an assasin of character. And his lament was drowned in such colossal ignorance.

He was defeated. But he should not on that account adjust his crusade. His physical appearance makes him look forlicsome. The ununderstanding of his audiance adds to this impression. That should not dilute his purpose.

As for the rest, it is for others in the broad democratic movement to understand this much maligned man, co-operate wherever possible, criticise wherever necessary but never to ignore. For Dr. Lohia, at all times, is a man to reckon with.

I saw Dr. Lohia after an interval of twenty years. In 1947, I used to see him in a corner room in a house on Barakhamba Road, New Delhi. He would sit before a small desk, holding his head in his palms, vacantly looking at those sitting on the other side of the desk. He would speak little.

He was then a much-disillusioned man. Jayaprakash had already slipped into his meaningless sentimentalism. Sri Asoka Mehta was revelling in his "vineyard of socialism". "Weaving garlands" of splenderous phrases. Gandhi was inevitably moving to his martyrdom. And Nehru was becoming very popular in the new dilettantis society that was emerging.

Freedom did not bring that opportunity for which Dr. Lohia was hoping. He was a greatly disappointed man.

From this disillusionment has emerged a new movement—which combines the rage that one saw in his underground pamphlet "Synthetic famine" and the cold analysis that permeates his 'Mystery of Sir Stafford Cripps".

Dr. Lohia, himself, appears esoteric. In fact, he is just a logical revolutionary.

52

FOREIGN POLICY : DR. LOHIA'S THOUGHT

DINKAR SAKRIKAR

It is said that the worst philosopher is one who says 'I told you so'. This indicates, if taken seriously a bias against foresight and vision. In an age of glorified mediocrities and inflated nonentities, anyone displaying vision and foresight is necessarilly despised and denigrated. Mediocrities can never tolerate a genius, cannot ever recognise vision and certainly cannot appreciate foresight which they themselves do not possess. It therefore becomes a crime to be a genius when mediocrities are in power.

Dr. Rammanohar Lohia is guilty of being blessed with vision and foresight. Even a cursory list of the "firsts" to his credit would indicate how he brought to the forefront issues which when he raised them were ignored or side tracked but were finally thrust upon the nation and had to be tackled in a desperate and, therefore, inept manner, or were not tackled at all and therefore brought disaster on the country. He was the first and only Indian leader to support the Nepalese people's revolt against Ranacracy. His activities in support of Nepal's struggle were sowned upon by the then Prime Minister, but it was the Prime Minister who had to back-track upon his position on Nepal. King Tribhuvan was forced to join this struggle. The King had to be given shelter in the Indian embassy in Kathmandu. Again Dr. Lohia was the first to hold a conference of the people of the Himalayan region in a bold imaginative attempt to integrate border people with the rest of India. The attempt was ridiculed, its significance overlooked.

The price for this was paid in 1962, when China invaded this region and swept through it. Again it was Dr. Lohia who succeeded in forging a common link with the Japanese Socialist Party and the joint communique he issued with the Japanese Socialist Party leaders was the first (and the last) joint action by Indian and Japanese socialists. Apart from Government leaders, even his colleagues in the socialist movement did not grasp the opportunity offered by that joint communique with the result that Japanese Socialist Party soon passed under Chinese influence and adopted anti-Indian postures on Sino-Indian dispute. There are still a number of such issues of vital importance to India, to Afro-Asia and to the world which he has constantly sought to project. He was the first to predict the possibility of approximation of of world capitalism and world communism. At that time some wiseacres tried to ridicule the thought by distorting it as a theory of equidistance. Actually Dr. Lohia talked about equal irrelevance of the two systems to the developing nations and never once used the mathematical term equidistance The political tricksters had the audacity to teach the political scientist that mathematical equations do not work in politics. Now the trickster is exposed for what he is and Dr. Lohia's theory of the equal irrelevance of communism and capitalism based on their growing approximation with each other stands vidicated by what is happening in the USSR and Eastern Europe and the growing collaboration between the two global powers. Just for record let it be noted that he alone of all world thinkers has formulated the only rational solution to a peaceful world order by suggesting abolition of veto, universality of UN membership and a world parliament elected on adult suffrage. Nearer home he alone has offered the only possible solution to the Indo-pak conflict viz. an Indo-pak confederation. He alone has reminded Indians of their moral duty to support the struggle of the Pakhtoons, and has constantly exhorted them to be ashamed of India's connivance at the Chinese 'infanticide' in Tibet. These policy-formulations are not the result of clever or smart political thinking. The difference between him and his contempories is just this : while they depend on pragmatic approach to serve the moment Dr. Lohia's vision enables him to perceive the future as a contimum of the past, history as a projection of geography, national interests as expressions of a coherent world-view. He is perhaps the only politician

in India who knows India's geogrophy as much as he knows Indian history, who knows as much about India's culture and languages as he knows about world culture and languages. It is because of this depth and breadth of the knowledge of his own country and of the world that his forgen policy formulations possess an acumen absent in the thinking, such as it is, of many others on this subject.

Last year when Lin Pao wrote his new famous thesis of urban and rural areas of the world, the former developed, rich and imperialist, the latter undeveloped, poor and exploited and called for the encirclement of the urban by the rural masses, political commentators in the West suddenly became aware of a potential threat and a new challenge to Western power. Nearly ten years ago, speaking on 'Foreign Policy" at Hyderabad Dr. Lohia had referred to this situation. He had then observed "In the past two hundred years, the world has been divided into the enormous *town* of Western Europe which manufactured commodities in factories and a much more enormous *village* of the rest of the world, which grows agricultural commodities." This relationship has existed for two hundred years. Western Europe lives on this relationship but America and Russia have no need to do so. Therefore, Dr. Lohia suggests, there "is a great opportunity for America and Russia to understand not only that they are leaders of the world today but also that they have no stake in the world of yesterday, that they have no vested interest either in physical rule or in manufactured". Upon the ability or inability of America and Russia to show this understanding towards the great village of Asia depends chances for peaceful solution of the major conflicts in the world. Even today this analysis of Dr. Lohia holds good and in fact points to the only possible line of action which the USA and USSR can follow to counteract the Red Chinese propaganda.

Dr Lohia is one politician who does not evade the question of race relationship and its impact on the world. In his characteristic blunt manner he says, "I want the peoples of this world to recognise that the most vital and dominating and significant split in the world today is between the white and coloured peoples, that the white peoples own all the good things of this earth." Dr. Lohia does not seek a reversal of this position, that is to say, to bring black people to the top. No, he says, "I do not want my country to sit on the top again. But I would want the coloured people to

become equal with the white people." For that, he says, facts as they exist must be recognised.

According to Dr. Lohia the most significant aspect of the European socialism has been its failure to understand these facts of world situation today and to evolve a world view which could deal with this situation. "European Socialists", Dr Lohia observes, "are so much taken up with the problems of the moment, the statistical evidence and requirements of their own nation, that they miss the complete view and the world view. . . . European socialism does not wish to face the fact that it is striving for plenty and equality in a small area amidst a world full of poverty and tyranny. This lack of a world view must force it always to be on the defensive, to lack elan, to make it go slow in its own areas and to have no answer for War and its Wasters".

The basic content of this world view must be the concept of equality. All democratic documents of world history such as "The Declaration of Independence", "The Declaration of the Rights of Man and Citizens", "The Agreement of the People" or even the more ancient Funeral Oration of Pericles stressed the concept of equality. But even in twentieth century the concept has remained largely an inclusive concept with a preferential limitation encompassing only citizens of a nation. Dr. Lohia believes that it is essential for the future of the world that the egalitarian idea be extended to nation. He is aware that "It is difficult for satified nations to contemplate economic and political equality with hungry nations". But unless they do so "The world will be doomed to a state of poverty and war and increasing stagnation". He says "The world and its nations need mutual assistance. Europe and the US have too much to conserve and too little to create, while Asia and Africa have too much to create but too little to build it on. Not the passing conflict of power blocs but this great war of our epoch determines man's destiny. When Europe and US realise the impossibility to conserve, until Asia and Africa create, a world mind potent enough to form world government will have been born."

This being the central point of his thinking on world situation it is not surprising that he remains almost alone in not being impressed by the shibboleths of Afro-Asian solidarity. This despite his insistence on what he calls "the frontiers of skin colour, the rich and the powerful white as against the coloured poor

and weak." This is not, he emphatically states, "a plea for a combination of coloured peoples." Hs does not believe nor does he propagate such a combination because he has always denied "a single Asia or Africa." He talks of three Asias, the Asia of chaos of communism, and the Asia of conservation or capitalism and feudalism. His only modification of this classification is the admission that the "Asia of change or socialism has not yet come into being in any effective way. What is masquerading in its place is the Asia of corrupt pseudo-leftism". But even this statement was made in February 1963. Although it is still very much applicable to India it would be interesting to know that Dr. Lohia has to say about the Asia of change that has developed in UAR or Burma. However, reverting to the main issue "coloured combination", Dr. Lohia believes, "irrespective of ideologies, have always been a sham". This has been proved by the fiasco of the second Bandung Conference and the disruption largely due to Sino-Soviet conflict of the Afro-Asian solidarity Organisation. Dr. Lohia asserts that "any coloured combination to achieve equality with the white peoples is therefore devoid of value". What then is the way to bring about the equality between the white and the coloured ? Dr. Lohia answers it : equality between the white and the coloured may be achieved by "a combination of all those who desire equality, irrespective of their skin colour". (The Chinese Communists despite their fierce passion for equality seek a combination of only those who have the same skin-colour i.e. of the non-white). In achieving this equality the US and the USSR hold the key position. That is why Dr. Lohia has repeatedly suggested that these two powers should come together not only for the narrow and limited purpose of seeking relaxation of tensions or tensions of nuclear disarmament of various degrees but for a wider purpose of "destruction of poverty, for achievement of parity between agricultural and industrial prices, for increasing equality between the white and the coloured".

This statement of Dr. Lohia offers the most clear, the most definite and the most concrete exposition of the aims which India's foreign policy should seek to achieve in world politics. There is no loose, abstract sentimental talk of peace and co-operation, of brotherhood of man and equality of nations but a very precise almost clinical formulation of policy objectives.

The world role which Dr. Lohia prescribes to India is a

projection of this world view. For him the 'acid test' of India's foreign policy is whether Free India is becoming "a maker of world peace and prosperity, if not its prime creater". As he sees it freedom of India has made no difference to the world and its ways. He recognises that to the extent that free India was weak in armour and industry she "would have been in any event, displaced from the centre of world affairs. But ideas are at least as potent a tool in foreign policy as steel, and the constructs of a new world repose as much in men's minds as in the weapons which their hands wielded". After the revolution Bolshevik Russia attempted to construct a new world and that made her foreign policy effective despite her weakness in armour and industry. India's "displacement from the creative centre of the world stage" is not so much due to her military or industrial weakness but due to "the immeasurable poverty of ideas" and "the refusal to take risks for a new hope at home and abroad". Dr. Lohia believes that "India should. . . .follow an independent and creative policy." What are the ingradients of this "independent" and "creative" policy ?

On the world plane the policy must 'stay the twin dangers of hunger and war'. He advocates a 'positive two-fold policy of world parliament and world government on the one hand, and world Development on the other". This is in sharp contrast with the official policy of relying on verbal panegyries of peace without any definite ideas about how to promote it. More especially, the Indian policy has never so forcefully projected either the issue of world poverty or the responsibility of the rich 'white' nations for it. A foreign policy to be meaningful must in the first place be "sustained by internal achievements and creation of raw strength". He believes that the practice of democratic socialism can alone secure the entire Asian region stretching from Cairo to Jakarta ideologically and economically while "a series of mutual assistance pacts would provide it some armed security". The basic cause of the ineffectiveness of India's foreign policy has been that it never had any such concrete objectives to persue or a definite programme to follow. Therefore Indian Government could show no initiative and could only react favourably or otherwise to what others do. "The India Government rarely acts; it only reacts".

Nowhere is the truth of Dr. Lohia's criticism so painfully demonstrated as in India's failure to secure firm relationship with

her immediate neighbours such as Pakistan or Nepal or even her sensitive border areas like Urivasiyam (NEFA). Dr. Lohia was the only national leader who since as far back as 1950 repeatedly warned the Government against their policy of neglect and indifference towards border areas. Despite these warnings "these people and the regions have been deliberately kept soft, as a standing invitation to foreign aggressor". The Urvasiyam, an area of 30,000 sq. miles was kept "in cold storage, insulated from any further development, with its people eternally condemned to the primitive stages of life". In Sikkim the people have not yet been given the right to elect their own government. If Nepal is not vulnerable today as it once was, it is because a popular struggle once took place and some kind of a popular democratic government was invaded Indian passivity did a great harm to Tibet, the world and to India herself. However, Dr. Lohia does not merely offer this pungent criticism of India's frontier policy but has given to the country positive alternatives to follow. He would for instance accept the McMohan Line if Tibet is free but as China has made Tibet forcibly a part of China, the Indian border will have to be drawn by Kailash and Mansarover with India. The border areas occupied by China must be taken back without much delay. Tibet must become free. It must be clearly understood that a positive foreign policy can be built only when our friends and neighbours are made strong. A strong Nepal, a free and strong Tibet and strong Sikkim and Bhutan are essential for India's national safety.

Dr. Lohia's views on various issues of Indian foreign policy as well as on world problems have been outlined in his numerous speeches and writings These have been compiled and brought together in a volume. Dr. Lohia's views on foreign policy and international politics have acquired a special significance in view of his own pivotal role in Indian politics and in view of the dramatic changes in India's political pattern. This volume therefore deserve a careful study by all students of international politics.

53

ONE GETS SO LONELY

HARRIS WOFFORD, JR.

When Che Guevara died, many radical young Americans toasted his name. We each should have our favorite revolutionaries political artists and teachers, and I have been luckter than anyone deserves. Yet in one season of death, the most Socratic teacher ever expect to meet (and a friend of Rammanohar Lonia's). Scott Buchanan, has died and two of the men to whom I was most devoted in politics, Robert Kennedy and Martin Luther King, were killed. And this year of tears began with the terrible loss of Rammanohar Lohia, a man who will always walk on the waters of my memory as the embodiment of a permanent and peaceful revolution.

Rammanohar would have appreciated the reason this tribute was somewhat delayed : that a funny thing happened to its author on the way to the Post Office—he went to jail.

"When will you go to jail ?" Rammanohar kept pressing that question in each of our meetings over the last ten years. Almost as if to show that it wasn't to difficult, even in America, he himself on his last visit here was arrested in Mississippi for disobeying local segregation practices.

It was a question he had put to young audiences, and particularly to Negroes, on his first trip here in 1951. His widespread and eloquent case for civil disobedience, as a powerful and necessary from of political persuasion in a complex modern society, was one of the outside factors along with many internal American

factors that moved some young Negroes, such as Martin Luther King, to begin a decade of non-violent direct action.

Rammanohar would also have approved the particular issue that led to this writer's arrest and one-night stand in a Chicago jail : a peaceful march in protest against police violence and lawlessness in breaking up popular demonstrations during the Democratic National Convention. It was over police violence under an administration of his own party that Rammanohar once resigned from the leadership of his party. Believing that there was no more important issue than affirming that an Asian is not a fly and that the State must respect and protect human life, Rammanohar had called for the resignation of his party's first state government, pending an investigation of the facts of a police killing of some demonstrators. When the failed to follow his lead, he himself resigned. On his 1951 trip to the United States, he had talked of the need for that kind of action : "I wish a tribe of politicians arose all over the world, which would specialize in doing its job without holding offices. A big problem for mankind today is how to time power. Perhaps one way to do that is by voluntary abdication of power. At least we should give that a try."

In retrospect, it is amazing how relevant to our current affairs are the major themes of Lohia's 1951 visit—and of his main ideas over the years. His formula of *Spade*, *Prison* and *Vote* reflects the means we are coming to call "the New Politics." The Spade, he said, was the symbol for unpaid constructive activity and voluntary service. He wanted to see full-time volunteer brigades and millions of part-time volunteers giving "one hour a day for the community." The Prison symbolized the climax of many less drastic froms of peaceful direct action protest. The traditional democratic method of the Vote would be less of a skeleton if people no longer felt powerless between elections; if they took on the flesh and blood of volunteer service and non-violent struggle.

Against racial segregation and against the war in Vietnam thousands of Americans have been standing up, sitting down, marching and going to jail. And more and more. Americans are discovering that it is possible and necessary to engage in immediate constructive service, to do something human and significant now even before securing state power, to invent institutions and organize private programmes of reform even without winning elections. One of the strong lines Robert Kennedy was pursuing in his last year

was what Lohia would call the Spade. Black citizens are using the Spade, on an increasing scale, to make Black Power a reality in a score of inner-city communities. The overseas Peace Corps of a a dozen countries and many domestic volunteer programmes represent this, too, and Secretary-General U Thant has proposed the universal recognition of one or two years' volunteer service at home or abroad as an essential part of one's education as a citizen.

Lohia's other main goals, which seemed to some so romantic two decades ago, have also been turned up by the political tides as very contemporary proposals.

Recalling his words during the 1951 trip, one sees what a coherent and instructive view of the world he lived by. Decentralization—his idea of "government of the local community, by the local community, for the local community"—is now a current battle cry even in America, the citadel of big organization and centralization. "The only way to make democracy live to the people would be to cut up sovereign power in as tiny bits as possible so that the common man his village and township can understand political affairs and make intelligent use of them," he said. Such decentralization would "enable us to rouse populations into activity." Black leaders are saying the same thing now. With the drive of black communities for power, and new theories of federalism emerging, town and regional as well as state and federal governments may yet be empowered and Lohia's *Four Pillar State* become a reality.

Once Lohia said he was honored to be called a "Jeffersonian Socialist" but added that Jefferson was dangerous although "very regretfully a Jefferson has not so far ever won in any country."

> "A Jefferson is sanctified in a University while a Hamilton prevails in Wall Street. All the streets, all the payments, all the machines, all the clothes, and everything that we do, is Hamiltonian. The time is come on the word's stage for Jefferson to win."

At least the time has come when more and more people everywhere share Lohia's sense of the equal irrelevance of capitalism and communism.

"The distinctions between the two camps are obvious. I am throughly aware of the evils of the Soviet system. But to distinguish between them is not to prefer. I just don't. I want something new, that goes beyond Mr. Ford or Mr. Stalin, and I would be lost if I stopped to prefer one of the old systems. We want neither. Communism can give as little bread to Asia as capitalism can give it freedom. Both are doctrines of centralization."

Both lacked what Lohia called "soul." Stalin had asked, "What is this thing called 'soul' ?" The reply : "That which you have not got." Lohia added :

"From and Stalin are different eyes of the same mind. They both believe in mass production, large-scale technology, and centralization, and this ultimately means the same kind of civilization. If all this, in the form of either capitalism or communism, could be applied in our two-thirds of the world, then I would be on weaker ground. "But it simply cannot work. To bring India to the U.S. level it would require. say, five hundred billion dollars."

It may be people in countries of affluence who are drawn most to Lohia's idea of new civilization that would "abolish poverty and attain a *decent standard of living*—but which will not awaken the erosive urge to an *ever-increasing* standard of living." In Alabama he was asked by a prosperous farmer : "Now that we have this materialistic bull by the tail, how do you think we can let him go ?" Lohia prophecied "Today, anyone to be listened to must pay homage to mas production and its system, but I suggest that twenty years hence, anyone who wants to benefit mankind must operate inside the concept of a decent standard of living."

Nearly twenty years later Third Camp that Lohia championed, "the Asia of peaceful change", a "free and united Africa," the belt of independent nations from Belgrade to Jakarta, was still in Lohia's terms "soft," yet one of his prescriptions for hardening it--keeping out of the cold war conflict—was spreading. And the Yugoslavia Lohia loved not only still stands, its infection is speading within the Communist world. "Should all the small or retarded nations of the world as determinedly seek their own patterns of

progress and freedom as Yugoslavia has done." he said upon arrival in New York from Belgrade, "the international caste system of five Brahmin nations and over sixty pariah nations will begin to end."

At least the Negroes who spurned Lohia's constant plea that they interest themselves in Africa would probably now respond—in fact he might find them immersed in an effort to discover their African roots. "I am no more interested in Africa than in Argentina," the wife of a leading Negro college president told him then. "Well I am," he said strongly. (A white waitress in those days of Southern segregation was at first puzzled by Lohia's dark skin, but served us, saying later she knew he was no coloured man).

Lohia predicated that with the rise of African power, aesthetic concepts would change, and black would be recognized as beautiful. If black people had held power and been subjugating Europeans for four hundred years, the standards of beauty for a Venus would be very different. He called for concerted effort to assist the final drive for African freedom. Will Africans use their freedom well ? "The question is frivolous and has no meaning—which people has used its freedom well ? When I look at the history of the last 400 years of modern civilization, I have grave doubts whether it is so worth imitating."

Violence was one of the attributes of modern civilization he would like to exorcise. "Do not use the Sten-gun or the revolver or the acid bomb," he said, quoting Mrs. Aung San, the widow of the murdered founder of modern Burma.

I believe in revolutions" Lohia told Americans, but there was good reason for the world-wide "creeping paralysis" and "disillusionment amounting to disbelief." Revolutions that go violent end up something quite the opposite of what they profess, he said, "and leave an ashen taste in the mouth." With the sound of the guns, the cries of starving people in Biafra, and the tramp of the troops in Chicago and Prague, this too is an issue to which Lohia still speaks with great power.

> "Would it now be possible to carry out a revolution through the agency of sympathy ? But I would also add anger. Not bitterness, jealousy, or hatred, but sympathy and anger. Anger very definitely because, if I may at this stage draw your attention to a big revolution that Mahatma Gandhi carried out,

let no one make a mistake about it, he was at times very angry and resorted to quite angry methods."

One revolution in thought was the breaking loose from the bonds of nationalism. "It is time for us to try to have a world mind." he said. For him, it meant he felt free to criticize his country abroad, and felt enough at home in the United States to court jail in one of its states still practising segregation. In league with Garry Davis ("World Citizen Number 1") and a French movement for world citizenship that had by plebiscite "mundialized" an area comprising three million people, Lohia caused a number of Indian villages and towns, as well as the University of Lucknow, to adopt a "World Charter" and vote themselves "fragments of world territory." The nation-state was for him then, as it has become for so many young men and women of "New Politics" throughout the world today, one of the alien or boring big bureaucracies to be bypassed, superseded and changed. He called for a World Parliament with power to enforce peace and promote economic development.

But, aside from his suggestive and prophetic ideas, he embodied—in warm flesh and with strong muscle and irrepressible spirit—something else, perhaps even more important today. He practised dialectic—a hard and vulgar, yet eloquent and graceful dialectic of persuasion. He was in a constant dialogue with himself, his friends, his party, his people. Gandhi (who sand of Lohia that he did not know a braver or straighter man) would call it a dialogue with truth.

On that 1951 trip to America, Lohia stung and stirred people from coast to coast—and on a Town Meeting of the Air broadcast to millions of Americans, he challenged each person and group to re-examine basic proposigens and dogmas. To comfortable Negro professionals he prescribed jail and involvement in the African freedom movement. To an audience of white southerners he told of his dream that all mankind would become mulatto, and gave an ancient Indian definition of "race" : All who can produce childern of each other." To the Americans for Democratic Action he asked why they were for socialism all around he world, but not in America. To the Unitarians at a Star Island conference who sang, "I'll determine my little liberal light all around the world," be responded by advocating the principle most even to Unitarian

doctrine : anger.

> "The choice lies between a revolution with peaceful means and a revolution with a revolver or the atom bomb. And we have made our choice, and this is all that I can offer to men of religion and goodwill : that the means we shall employ shall be those of sympathy and, of course, anger; for no man who is prepared and willing to resist injustice can deprive himself of this great and good and glorious quality of anger. If his eye does not redden at an act of injustice, he shall hardly be in a position to shed a tear of sympathy."

As a foil to his often sharp and puckish dialectic, Lohia also knew the great and good and glorious virtue of silence and solitude, and he could draw himself out of politics to drink of the waters of the earth and breathe the air of poetry. He walked many hours by himself in the Redwood forest of California. "The larger part of mankind will probably think of honeymoons and sunsets and dawns," he reminded a politically enthusiastic audience at Stanford University. What does the morning look like in India ? Does the self ever meet self ? These were the greater questions, he said, for most people who belong to "the largest single party in the world, the party of non-political people." And the real test of a civilization, he suggested, was how its women think and look. America scored fairly well on his scale. "At a sidewalk cafe it is hard to tell a laundress from a duchess. That is a glorious accomplishment, better than we ever achieved in 6,000 years. But you are at a point where you must think anew."

His sympathy for America survived all the dark corners he saw. "I can claim to be an American," he said. "After all, I have lived with America in a manner of speaking for nearly thirty years. Your Boston Tea Parties, and Lincoln and Jefferson, those were the meeting grounds, and then, of course, your individual men and women. I have fascination for the American people, and doubts about modern civilization, of which America is the climax."

The fascination began in 1933, when an American girl wept because the concierge would not let two coloured men go up to her room. "This made me think that there is something good in America," he said at Fisk College. "The American is still primitive enough to show her sympathy and cry for convictions. That was

Maxine. And then there was Josephine Baker. At that time she was taking Paris by storm and she took me by storm too. It makes no difference—in Tripoli the lips are thick, in Paris the lips are thin, in Berlin the skin is fair, in Nashvile the skin is dark, but 'underneath, my treasure, all else is the same'."

And through it all, even through this recurring anger and many disappointments, even with an ashen taste in his mouth, he laughed. Not long before his death I read a curious article in *Mankind* in which Lohia's laugh was criticized. Indians were put of by his smiling, they could not take a man seriously who laughs so much, the article concluded. That brought a flood of memories over me, of our first meeting, when it was his merriment in the midst of action that so intrigued and charmed us. Later we saw him retain that merriment in the midst of much melancholy and even agony. What he called "the vanity of fulfilment" was never his to enjoy. Yet he remained a happy warrior. So I would amend the proposition : Do not take a man seriously who does not laugh about the important things

In 1951 Lohia went to meet Albert Einstein in Princeton, and the great, hearty laughts these two men shared as they surveyed the world are unforgettable.

"May I ask you a question, Dr. Einstein ?" Lohia had begun.

> "Not about politics. I have come here to learn from you, and in politics I suppose I might even have something to tell you. But in the higher field of the human mind we need you help. In Berlin, I said that our age has thought only twice, Mahatma Gandhi and atomic energy; one is gone, and our invention is a source of death. How is the human mind to get out of this stagnation, this confinement and rigidity which is stifling it ? Do you see a new integration which can free thought for new voyages of discovery ?"

When the two men parted, Einstein put his arm around Lohia and said : "It is so good to meet a *Man*—one gets so lonely."

Long ago Lohia wrote : "God and Woman are the two purposes of life. I have not met God and women is elusive, but once I met a man and his memeory shimmers the path."

He meant Gandhi. I mean Lohia.

One gets so loney.

54

WITHOUT LOHIA

RAJINDER PURI

Mr. Nehru was quite obviously rattled by the hunourable member from Farukhabad. "He spoke at the common level of the market place." he snapped answering the only no-confidence debate his Government over faced in Parliament.

The newly elected member from Farukhabad, triumphant after making the most brilliant and biting maiden speech heard in the House for many years, had absented himself while an packed Lok Sabbha heard Mr. Nehru in silence. His absence from the House was a characteristic gesture of contempt by Rammanohar Lohia who Mr. Nehru's Government had thrown into prison more than sixteen times in the less than sixteen years of India's independence.

Unwittingly, Mr. Nehru had paid his most pungent critic a compliment. Lohia's entire political career was, in fact, the conscious effort of a sophisticate to translate matters of high policy into the simple jargon of the common man.

Few leaders have had a private face so different from their public image as Lohia did. He was temperamentally an intellectual of a European Cafe Society. With head thrust forward from his squat body, and with the cocky swagger of a bantamweight, Lohia, trailed by a host of admirers, was a common sight at the Coffee Houses of Delhi, Lucknow or Patna. Despite his *bonhomie* with homespun rustics and city clerks, with labourers, students, journalists, with Coffee House idlers, penniless poets and society's

dropouts, Lohia was sensitive enough to wince at the mention of anything crude or obscene. He tried not to show it. Essentially a lonely man, he was always keen to be accepted as one of the gang.

While returning from a Coffee Session in a resturant, a friend teased Lohia about his discomfiture during the narration of a bawdy tale by one of the many admirers who inevitably attached himself to his table. Lohia was visibly upset, "Did I show it ?" he anxiously asked.

He never affected a highbrow fancy for obscure artists with snob value. His tastes were quiet, and unexceptional for one who had studied in Europe. He enjoyed Bach, Paul Robeson and Saigal. He was enchanted with the musical socre of 'My Fair Lady' which he often played in his house. He saw the film thrice.

His manners were impeccable. Towards women he was extravagantly, almost comically, gallant. He would affect at times on old world charm and flourish which had the finer shades of Uttar Pradesh and pre-war Europe, a hangover perhaps, from his early student days in Banaras and Berlin where the young Lohia obtained his doctorate.

In recent years he preferred simple food but had no fads. At tea in a resturant once, he asked for *mithai.* The waiter said they kept no *mithai.* Lohia realised it was too Westernised a restaurant. He Switched to English and asked eagerly in his haw-haw accent "How about some scones—do you have scones ?" The waiter did not understand what scones were. They had pastry, he said. Lohia relapsed back into Hindi. "Forget it" he said, obviously disappointed and grumpy "You're all phoney westerners."

That about sum up his attitude. Though he loved India and greatly admired the West, he never learnt to come to terms with Indo-Anglian culture. He thought it chee-chee and vulgar. He was acutely embarrassed by the Indian elite doing such a bad job of imitating the English.

This fierce search for an Indian identity after independence in formed Lohia's entire approach to radicalism. Like Jayaprakash it had brought him closer in thought to Gandhi and set him apart from Communists and doctrinaire socialists. Though he had not systematised his thoughts, Lohia had an integrated approach to politics which was important because it heralded a new and more

genuinely Indian left than anything put forward by Communists and other socialists.

He had recognised that in India a change in property relations was not necessarlly egalitarian. That is why, in recent years, he had shifted emphasis from nationalisation to a ceiling on expenditure. It was to dramatize this that Lohia started that famous controversy in Parliament proving that 27 crore Indians live on three annas a day. Mr. Nehru badly burnt his fingers trying to dispute that, and he carefully avoided getting involved in any wrangle with Lohia in Parliament after that. Lohia understood that even with nationalisation the country's resources could be used to fatten the westernised urban elite.

The communists hated the Zamindar and the Marwari businessman. Lohia hated the ICS. For him the great divide lay between the illiterate peasants and the microscopic westernised ruling class which could overawe, intimidate and ultimately force into emulation the rural politician and the moneyed *Seth* when they made contact with it. That is why he passionately fought for "Angrezi hatao". He wished to break down the class barrier which he thought the English language and phoney westernism had set up in India.

Unlike the Communists, he had little use for class struggle between employers and employees. He thought it a western concept largely irrelevant in underdeveloped India. For Lohia, caste injustice was the great crucible of social revolution and class struggle. He thought the Communists dishonest and evasive when they refused to formally grant the right of adequate representation to the depressed castes.

Caste was also very important to Lohia in his strategy for power, Lohia was too romantic to strive for a mere Prime Ministership. He wished to be the unquestioned leader of the Nation like a Gandhi, a Nehru, or a Mao. He evolved his strategy accordingly. He cast as wide a net as he could, and addressed his appeal to the anti-English illiterates, the depresssed castes, the landless labour and the untapped rural woman vote.

He had an amoral fascination for power. Like a tribal warlord he weighed allies and adversaries by the mass following they could attract. Largely, it was this respect for power which made him prefer the Left Communists to the Right. He had a hearty contempt for the urban, cautious, increasingly respectably Right

Communists. Lohia's comparative admiration for Namboodiripad dwindled not because they had oppposite views on China. It was because Lohia thought Namboodiripad never understood that to play the international power game effectively India could not tie herself to China. In domestic politics too, Namboodiripad disappointed Lohia because his vision seemed limited to Kerala.

Lohia never tried to deliberately split the elite, as the Communists did. He never sought a lobby in the national press or support from "progressive" industrialists. He spurned infiltration. He wanted a direct confrontation. He had faith that with numbers on his side, if the masses could be aroused the elite would capitulate.

While Lohia's strategy was sound, his tactics were disastrous. His failure was essentially one of style. His inability to adequately project himself was almost absolute. It was not just his intellectual arrogance and bouts of temper that came in his way—in recent years he had mellowed and overcome these weaknesses to a large extent. It was the total lack of rapport between him and the national press that plagued him. Lohia attempted to dramatize general policy objective through symbolic acts like Gandhi did. But while Khadi, the Salt March and the Charkha made Gandhi a saint, Lohia's assault on British statues made him appear like a crackpot and frightened many people away.

He was all brain, and he sought attention as an ad-man or a newspaper headline writer would. He almost completely lacked the politician's instinct for public approval which was so strong in Gandhi and Nehru. He gave the impression of a political scientist trying to work out his theories in the field. Lohia did not despise Nehru. He despised all that he belidved Nehru had come to symbolise—a mass appeal based on aristocracy and a hollow radicalism.

But beyond poor projection there was a basic contradiction which Lohia had failed to resolve. He wanted to hasten change in a non-violent democracy by the gestures of a violent revolution. He was not bloody minded enough to actually work for a violent revolution. So he sought electoral gains by inciting the petty violence of student agitators. He failed to utilise institutions to bring about change, so he attempted upheavals. Perhaps all this was not a calculted tactic. It could well have been a basic contradiction in this personality itself. He was a Gandhian who loved a scrap.

But in spite of Lohia, Lohia was beginning to prevail. At a party for several opposition leaders thrown by Maharaja Karni Singh a few months ago, when Lohia walked in his host announced "Gentlemen, meet the next Prime Minister." Nobody laughed, and there was an uneasy silence. Lohia had ceased to be a joke and had grown in personal stature at an almost unbelievable pace in the last five years. Despite his abberations, his occasional ill-temper and his irreverence, Lohia was winning, because he was on the right side of history. He was the great debunker, the anti-hero, riding a billowing wave of discontent against the hollow piety and the worn out cliches of tired Congressman.

As Lohia futilely battled for his life in hospital, people suddenly realised his importance. He had become Mr. Opposition. The stream of leaders from every party and political faction in the country who gathered on the lawns of Willingdon Hospital gave him in death the recognition that eluded him in life. If Nehru's death left avoid in the Establishment, Lohia's departure has orphaned the rebels who seek to overthrow it. None among the opposition, or among his own followers, has his elan, spunk and vision.

It was a warm September morning when I last met Lohia.' We had gone out for coffee with Kishan Patnaik. After coffe, we dropped Kishan in Connaught Place and drove back to Lohia's house. We sat in the car and talked for half-an-hour. Lohia talked about Jayaprakash, Nehru and himself in 1946. He thought and himself in 1946. He thought. Nehru initially liked him more than he did Jayprakash. I suggested that Nehru turned against him because he suffered from a subconscious sense of insecurity, and Lohia was young and intelligent Lohia thought the idea novel. He pondered for a while, carefully considering it. Then he rejected it. He said that all that could be said was that perhaps he had hurt Nehru's vanity once too often. As he turned away, I asked him "What about Patel ?" He turned back and said with great regret. "We got on very badly. It was our fault, we were so dazzled by Nehru. I was too immature. I learnt to appreciate Patel years after his death."

"You should write about all this," I said.

He smiled, waved, and entered his house. As I backed the car down the driveway. I regretted making that tactless remark—one only writes memoirs after retirement. Tow days later, he entered hospital; Two weeks later, he was dead.

55

LOHIA'S FOREIGN POLICY ATTITUDES*

P. C. SHASTRI**

Abstract: While Jawaharlal Nehru was the exponent of India's foreign policy, few were there with foreign policy ideas of their own. An important exception was Rammanohar Lohia whose stand is examined here. His concept of a "Third Camp" is explained and India's role in it analysed more closely. Lohia's political ideas with regard to Asian unity as well as on the Himalayan countries are described, and his stand *vis-a-vis* Pakistan and China is delineated. India's pivotal position in Asia and in the Third World is stressed.

Even in the most advanced political systems foreign-policy-making is regarded as an especially esoteric function to be performed by only a gifted few. In the case of Indian foreign policy the "few" were virtually reduced to "one", as for nearly four decades one intellectual giant, Jawaharlal Nehru, acted as India's "window" on the world, shapping and moulding, first the foreign policy attitudes of the Congress, and later the foreign policy of the Government of free India. The result was that India's foreign policy became synonymous with Nehru's foreign policy.

Neither the critics nor the supporters of Nehru's foreign policy

* This paper was presented at a seminar on "Foreign Policies of South Asian States", held in February 1968 at the University of Rajasthan at Jaipur. In writing this paper I am thankful to Dr. C.P. Bhambhri and my senior colleague, Mr. P.C. Mathur.

** Department of Political Science, University of Rajasthan, Jaipur (Raj.).

had the capability to suggest alternatives or improvements, and the debate concerning foreign policy matters generally remained confined to the realms of whole-hog support or downright condemnation. Among the opposition parties and leaders, the Communists did have some ideas, but in the popular image they appeared to be merely tailing behind Nehru and, therefore, their capacity for creative contributions in the domain of foreign policy was severly limited. The only individual who spoke challengingly on foreign policy issues was Dr. Rammanohar Lohia, the socialist leader who, from the days of the National Movement, was actively associated with Jawaharlal Nehru and was once put in charge of the Foreign Affairs Department of the Indian National Congress.

Two books of his, *Fragments of a World Mind*[1] and *India, China and Northern Frontiers*.[2] reveal the penetrating insight that he had into the immediate and long-term problems of not only India but of Asia as a whole. Essentially he was concerned with the problems of those areas of the world which were either still groaning under the yoke of colonialism and other forms of exploitation or had just won their freedom. His ideas were a strange amalgam of idealism and practical wisdom and, while pronouncing on contemporary problems, he often made comments which seemed to be both realizable and immensely desirable. He did not consider any obstacle as insurmountable and, therefore, ventured to give many a daring suggestion to solve seemingly insoluble problems. His ideas in the realm of international politics and foreign policy and his attitude towards the problems India was faced with, coming as they did from a person who had no power to realize them, have nevertheless left a profound imprint on the socialist movement and an impact on contemporary India in world affairs.

An attempt is being made here to examine and evaluate Dr. Lohia's ideas concerning international politics and India's role therein. Dr. Lohia, even while working under the guidance of Nehru, showed remarkable initiative, and many times found himself at cross purposes with him. He was not the one to merely the line as laid down by Nehru. He had his own ideas and pursued them vigorously. It was only after independence that he found it possible to project his concepts in the sphere of foreign policy. But since he did not occupy any official position, his ideas

could not fructify into the realm of actual policies. However, one can find them scattered in his speeches, pamphlets and books, and if an attempt is made to piece them together it is possible to discern coherence and consistency in his approach to foreign policy and world problems.

LOHIA'S CONCEPT OF THE "THIRD CAMP"

Concerned as he was with the problems of developing and emerging nations of Asia, Africa, and Latin America, Dr. Lohia came forward with the idea of a "Third Camp" which, according to him, would carve out a socialist path for itself both in the national and in the international sphere. He thought that the salvation of the hitherto colonial world lay not in communism, which in his opinion was just another European device to dominate the erstwhile colonial empires, but in socialism with indigenous contents suited to the genius and requirements of the people. Lohia regarded "American Capitalism" and "Soviet Communism" as chips of the same block or, to use his own metaphor, two prongs of continuing European drive to enslave Asia, and called upon the socialists to work for the creation of a Third Camp.[3]

Lohia addressed his call for the formulation of this Third Camp to Europeans as well as Asian socialists but laid greater emphasis on the emergent Afro-Asian States. Of course, Lohia was fully alive to the divisive pulls and pressures already at work in the Afro-Asian countries and suggested a number of ways to take care of the internal frictions paralysing Indo-Pakistan and Arab-Israel relations. Basically, Lohia advocated a "federative approach" for reconciling all such tensions, and the idea of an Indo-Pakistani confederation was mooted by him as early as 1948.

Lohia wanted the Third Camp to play an active role in international relations and believed that "the third camp must *not* be an umpire but a participator in international events, because, it will never be able to judge issues until it learns to play a part in their maturing".[4] The germ of the concept of "dynamic neutrality" or "positive neutrality" was contained in Lohia's views regarding the role of a neutral block when he pointed out that "neutrality that is based on national selfishness or passive waiting on events is inconsistent with world view" and added that "to keep one's own

country out of war is something wholly different from keeping war out of the world. The former is passive neutrality arising out of national selfishness while the latter is active neutrality arising out of a world view."[5]

INDIA AND THE THIRD CAMP

Lohia's concept of "active neutrality" was different from Jawaharlal Nehru's "non-alignment". Nehru was too much concerned with the cold war between the two blocs and this left him with little time to devote to the realization of the Third Camp of Lohia's conception. Lohia had expected that Nehru with his earlier enthusiasm for Asian solidarity would pursue the task of making the Third Camp cohesive. It alone could bring into the foreground issues of economic reconstruction of all peoples and economic equality to them, of world government, of freedom and justice. This alone could have given the strength necessary to the Third Camp (and not only to Nehru) to dictate truce between the two blocs.

Together with his advocacy of the idea of a Third Camp, Lohia also took an active part in the movement for a world government. There were many who regarded the idea of world government with doubts and scepticism. He nevertheless persistently championed the cause of world government and initiated such projects as the opening of a register of world citizenship and the policy of mondializing several Indian villages.[6]

AN ASIAN POLICY

One of the basic maxims of Lohia's thinking on foreign policies was that Asia must first understand and sympathize with itself and then, if possible, evolve a common policy. He realized that Asia sufferred from many handicaps among which the existence of politics of religion or caste or race or language were the most notable. In a perceptive analysis of the Asian scene he pointed out that Asia lacked integrated thinking and discernment especially because Asian statesmen, while mouthing the slogan of socialism, were actually helping capitalism to get firmly enternched in Asian States.[7] He loathed the people's apathy towards their

own problems. He wanted them to get out of their age-old slumber and to actively participate in the common struggle for socialism in the Third Camp.[8]

Lohia was aware of the existence of divisive forces in the "Third World" and particularly in Asia which were being aided and abetted by capitalists and other vested interests to thwart the unity of the people. He emphasized that socialism was a force which could transcend religious, caste, and linguistic boundaries and unite them. The relations between India and Pakistan, spoiled by religious fanaticism on both sides, were profoundly affecting the pattern of affairs in the whole of South and South-West Asia and giving rise to separatist tendencies which could be checked only if the socialist forces asserted themselves in a struggle to replace bigotry by rerson.[9]

The intra-Asian tensions impairing the unity of Asia were a matter of deep concern to Lohia. However, he did not treat them all as of equal significance. Some tensions, as in Korea and Vietnam, were in his opinion the outcome of the power bloc rivalry and since they had reached beyond the Third Camp, Lohia would not like the Third Camp of his conception to get involved in them.[10] However, he pleaded for the solution of border problems between Asian countries on the basis of recognition of the existing frontiers and attached utmost impartance to this category of intra-Asian tensions. He even went to the extent of suggesting confederations between the disputing states so that the frontier problem affecting their mutual relations could be resolved.[11] He pleaded for a united front of the Third Camp to oust the colonialists from the Asian soil. Countries like Japan, which were being sucked into the Western Camp through economic and political penetration, deserved to be rescued by the combined efforts of the Third Camp.[12] He believed in self-reliant efforts to build the socialist Third Camp. Only by pursuing a policy of non-involvement in cold war politics and maintaining equidistance from both the Communist and the Western camp, was it possible for the Third Camp to carve out an independent path and thus play a more effective and constructive role in world affairs.[13]

A HIMALAYAN POLICY

Lohia was critical of the Indian Government's policies

towards the Himalayan Kingdoms of Sikkim and Bhutan. He was not a supporter of socio-economic *status quo* in these border states, and pleaded for a more vigorous and positive effort to modernize the societies still living under the heavy weight of outmoded traditions.[14] In the absence of such a policy, international vested interests—particularly the Western powers—were trying to extend their influence in these areas. He thought that the extension of influence by one power block would encourage the rival bloc to move in, and instead of India, which by rights should play the dominant role in the region, the cold warriors would make it an arena of their power politics. Tibet had already been lost to China, because India failed to fulfil her obligations towards the tradition-ridden peoples of the Himalayan region.[15]

INDO-PAKISTANI RELATIONS

The Nation's territorial integrity was dear to Lohia. While he was an advocate of a *rapprochement* with Pakistan, he was never prepared to achieve it at the expense of territorial sanctity. His suggestion for a confederation with Pakistan should, therefore, be understood in this context.[16] It is perhaps in the spirit of Lohia's concern for the inviolability of territorial boundaries that the SSP recently thought it necessary to protest against the Kutch Award.[17] In fact, he abhorred all such stands and policies which in any way compromised India's independence, national self-respect, and territorial integrity. He was, therefore, a vehement critic of India's continued membership of the Commonwealth. In his opinion, Commonwealth ties inhibited India's relations with other countries and circumscribed her Independence in defence and international relations.[18]

SINO-INDIAN RELATIONS AND DEFENCE

Pleading for a strong defence policy based on self-reliance, Lohia warned against Chinese intransigence and advocated a firm stand *vis-a-vis* Chinese expansionism.[19] India, in his opinion, should play a pivotal role in building up the Third Camp to face the challenge from across the Himalayas. He firmly believed that this challenge could be successfully met if India helped in the

development of social and economic dynamism in the Himalayan region and brought all the people into the realm of socio-economic cohesion and unity.[20] He gave secondary importance to the force of arms and exphasized the strength of social forces.[21]

Lohia's views on foreign policy and international politics, thus, bore an imprint of his personality—a vigorous nationalism imbued with the spirit of socio-economic egalitarianism which he wanted to realize through his concept of the Third Camp.

NOTES AND REFERENCES

1. Rammanohar Lohia, *Fragments of a World Mind* (Calcutta, 1952).
2. ——, *India, China and Northern Frontiers* (Hydrabad, 1963).
3. See Lohia, *Fragments of a World Mind*, Chapter 2, and his *The Third Camp in World Affairs* (Bombay, 1950), pp. 14 and 15.
4. Lohia, *The Third Camp in World Affairs*, pp. 14, 15.
5. *Ibid.*, p. 15.
6. *Ibid.*, p. 28.
7. See Rammanohar Lohia, *Aspects of a Socialist Policy* (Calcutta 1952).
8. *Ibid*,
9. Lohia, *Fragments of a World Mind*, p. 37.
10. *Ibid.*, p. 38.
11. *Ibid.*
12. *Ibid.*
13. *Ibid.*
14. *Ibid.*, p. 170.
15. *Ibid.*
16. *Lok Sabha Debates*, R.M. Lohia, III series, Vol. XXIX, 1964, p. 9112.
17. *Ibid.*
18. Madhu Limaye, *Why Samyukta Socialist* ? (Bombay, 1967) pp. 42-53.
19. *Lok Sabha Debates*, III Series, Vol. XXXX, 1964, p. 7097, R.M Lohia.
20. *Ibid.*
21. Limaye, *Why Samyukta, Socialist* ?, p. 54.

56

LOHIA : QUICKSAND REVOLUTIONARY

C.N. CHITTA RANJAN

One of the leading Left intellectuals thrown up by the freedom movement, Dr. Rammanohar Lohia has systematically driven himself from frustration to frustration over a period of three decades, without however losing much of his verve, originality, or infinite capacity for throwing a spanner in the works, gleefully unmindful of direction and deriving immense personal satisfaction from the mere fact of having created new confusion.

Dr. Lohia started public life with two major handicaps : he was totally convinced that he alone among the national leaders was clear about the aims and character of the kind of revolution India needed and was capable of translating these ideas into positive and purposeful action; and he had to fight for the top position from the second rung of the national leadership. Loved by Gandhiji, who could bestow affection on brave young men without accepting any of their ideas, Dr. Lohia may perhaps be pardoned for imagining that he was in the direct line of succession to the nation's supreme leader and consequently for feeling piqued when the mantle fell on Jawahrlal Nehru who thenceforward came to be looked upon as an usurper. What started as irritation grew into positive hatred in the years after Gandhiji and became so ingrained that it covered Nehru's descendant and successor in power at one remove. The SSP leader would surely be more kindly disposed towards the present Prime Minister but for her parentage.

Dr. Lohia undoubtedly is a theorist par excellence. A commentator wrote rather unkindly four years back : "Convinced that he can write the most phenomenal book since Marx, he does not sit down to it because he might in the process miss the Revolution he believes he is destined to lead." About his conviction of being the nation's Man of Destiny there can be no doubt; he has made no secret of it. Nor has he, in the writings he has sat down to briefly from time to time, given any indication of not being certain of being in a way greater than Gandhi and Marx, having found out the weaknesses of both and discovered the third infallible path of Revolution.

Educated in Germany at a time when Hitler was organizing to take over power, Dr. Lohia was obviously impressed by the techniques adopted by the Fuehrer even if he did not approve of the latter's aims or philosophy. For a long time he believed—it is not clear whether he continues to do so—that an organized army of men, unarmed to suit the national contex, should bring about the Revolution and transfer the fruits thereof to the mass of the people. His famous "Land Army" was one such concept. The people in his thinking were not directly involved in the process of Revolution; their participation was envisaged only after the learned doctor and his army-to-be had completed the Revolution, a task which could be accomplished only by a professional cadre under one supreme leader. The Pardi satyagraha illustrates the point : it was not a case of organising the trible people to occupy land but of a group of trained volunteers taking over the land and then distributing it among the tribals. Thus, the Lohia concept of Sri Jayaprakash Narayan at the time : the latter believed in a mass movement on the basis of mass awakening and organisation.

Again, Dr. Lohia at one stage thought in terms of caste war instead of class war, the logic being that in Indian society castes had taken the place of classes. This approach slurred over the existence of economic strata cutting across caste lines but this did not seem to worry Dr. Lohia, Barabanki stronghold of Dr. Lohia's party, once resounded to caste slogans.

He has always been fond of summing up a situation and a solution in a picturesque phrase, lending an air of intellectual mysticism to his periodic prononuncements. The theories of Equal Irrelevance, the Four Pillars, Approximation and Equidistance are examples. It looks as if he was occasionally assailed by

doubts but the mood never lasted long enough to bring about change in the man. He once wrote, for instance. "I have sometimes been made uneasy by my own programmatic extremism or immoderation".

Three periods of the socialist movement in India he once classified : from 1934 to 1948 was the "charter of the Ginger Group when the socialists, as part of the Congress, attemped to darg it leftward. In this period they were known as the Congress Socialist Party, none of whose members was clear about the direction in which the rest wanted the Congress dragged. The second phase of "the Big Noise" was from 1948 to 1951 (the Socialist Party) the pharse itself indicating the extent of achievement. The third from 1952 to 1955 was "the chapter of the Great Indecision" when Dr. Lohia and his men were part of the Praja Socialist Party. Then came the periods of breaks and mergers, without it being yet clear whether the cycle of Big Noise, and Great Indecision is over or not since once again there is talk of merger of the SSP and the PSP and there is no dearth of noise.

So long as Jawaharlal Nehru was alive, Dr. Lohia had little time or inclination to bother about much else, although he did permit his followers to play at Left unity from time to time. And every time apparent unity was achieved between the PSP and the SSP Dr. Lohia's personality stood in the way of its being cemented on the basis of a workable arrangement. His followers, even those who do not always agree with his dramatic stances, have seldom felt like defying him or putting pressure on him to be reasonable. This perhaps is one of the difficulties arising from hero worship among intellectuals.

After Nehru's death there was reason to hope that old obsessions would vanish giving way to a new purposefulness, and that Dr. Lohia and his followers would get down in right earnest to the long-neglected business of forging Leftist unity. This hope was not speedily realised for various reasons, chief among them so far as the SSP was concerned being Dr. Lohia's patent inability to shed complexes and prejudices acquired over long years. If Nehru was not there, his ghost was there to keep the SSP supremo busy. Demolition of the Congress, indentified with Nehru became the one consuming passion; the Revolution could wait; more so could Left unity. It

was only as the Fourth General Election approached and all the Opposition parties, including the progressive ones, became conscious of the immense possibilities opened up by a situation in which the Congress stood discredited and did not have the advantage of the Nehru spell, that the SSP leader was persuaded to work earnestly for Opposition unity. He spoke constantly of Left unity but this main pre-occupation was with any kind of alliance that could bring the Congress down to the dust. This is not to say that he alone was guilty of thinking on these lines, forgetting that it was even more important to consolidated the Left forces against the mounting pressure of the Right. Almost all Left parties were conditioned to the same type of thinking, some because they felt power had to be acquired or survival and some because they thought that once the Congress was reduced in size and improtance Left unity would not be so hard of achievement.

The Fourth General Election produced dramatic results which naturally gave room for hope of further changes leading to the Leftist forces acquiring power and using it for bringing about long-awaited drastic socio-economic changes. At a time when it was necessary to beware of the masre aims and steady progress of the parties of the Right, including the Right wing of the Congress. Dr. Lohia led the way in seeking an all-out Opposition alliance aimed at wiping out the Congress but without providing anything like a recognizable Left alternative. Pursuing the logic of his policy of discrediting the Congress, he made use of the forum of Parliament to engage in sentimental outbursts over Svetlana the delicate flower and in the pursuit of the diamond necklace and the mink coat to the exclusion of pressing problems of the people. His claim is that by focussing attention on the necklace and the mink coat he was attempting to pinpoint the contrast between the lives of the rulers and the ruled. In his pre-occupation with what to ordinary minds might appear to be irrelevant trifles in the context of the vast changes urgently needed in the country, he did not find time—or perhaps was not inclined—to fight against the increased pampering by the Goverment of the country's biggest industrial and business houses at the cost of the people's welfare. While Sri Madhu Limaye and Sri George Fernandes, two of his most brilliant lieutenants, were constantly trying to focus attention on the doings of big business houses and the CIA and its agents in India, Dr. Lohia was content to hold

forth on hear-beats, and flowers, and the like.

So far as the States are concerned, Dr. Lohia has adopted an intriguing attitude. While the SSP's insistence on the minimum programme being fulfilled in Kerala without delay is understandable, it is difficult to comprehend the significance of the party leader's attitude to the participation of a particular member in the Bihar Government. While constantly talking of a takeover at the Centre with the help of the Opposition's Right, Left and Centre, he is unwilling to give the coalition governments already formed either time or help to carrv out their promises. On the other hand, the Damocles sword of a threat to do walk out of the coalition governments is always present. Dr. Lohia may indeed be right in thinking that as power corrupts it is safer for his revolutionary spirit to stay out of power and keep the struggle going permanentlv. But once the concept of a coalition government is accepted, the implication of participation in power has to be accepted also, snd all else follows. One cannot agree to participate in power and insist on being an anarchist at the same time.

It must however be said to the credit of Dr. Lohia that he has been able to befuddle the Left parties in the country : he draws the red herrings, and the majority of the Left parties including the CPI and CPM change their courses. And he does not always do it openly or blatantly. There can be no other explanation for the Communists accepting Sri Subba Rao as the Opposition candidate for Presidentship or for leaving it to Sri Masani to act as the Opposition spokesman on crucial occasions.

Dr. Lohia has little more than contempt for most Opposition parties : he is sorry he once described the Jan Sangh as a dynamic party; the Jana Congress and the Jan Kranti Dai are "funny amalgams"; there are many "crows" parading as peacocks in Oppposition; and there are any number of "skunks" too. It is in the context of this supreme contempt for the rest of the Opposition that his continuing quest for Opposision unity despite, the setback in the Presidental election has to be viewed. In his latest pronouncement on strategy, Dr. Lohia has talked of "Opposition consolidation" being only the first objective, the others being socialist consolidation, united fronts, common platforms on single aims, and "building up their own respective parties and ideals". Such a stage-by-stage advance towards the socialist goal should be

unexceptionable if it were based on recogition of the genuineness and honesty of the other parties pledged to the same goal. It is not so. The last point of the five-fold plan is significant for an understanding of his mind. He does not talk of organising a socialist movement in which all the Left parties can participate; nor of mass party into which all the Left elements can be brought. He obviously believes that if the situation is kept continuously confused with various alliances and short-term agitations, his own party will emerge as the only socialist party and he can personally lead the country to a new socio-economic order. Maybe wishful thinking, but there it is. It would be unlike Dr. Lohia to concede that anyone else can lead the Revolution along the right lines. His frequently expressed admiration for a certain section of the Left would also seem to stem from the belief that in course of time he can get them under his wing.

A long time back Dr. Lohia wrote : "A comprehensive Opposition with a social outlook, wanting to achieve revolutionary changes in administration and economy, would be enduring both in its aims and methods . . . . A comprehensive Opposition breeds responsibility of outlook as well as of method, while an episodic opposition is as irresponsible in its fleeting aims as in its fleeting methods". Again, "the Socialist movement in India . . . . has suffered from a deadly malady. It has often provoked and excited without making adequate effort to fulfil and consolidate". Even if Dr. Lohia does not proceed always on the basis of this logic, it may be hoped that other SSP leaders will : there are indeed Indiçations that the rising stars on the SSP horizon would prefer making the adequate effort to fulfil and consolidate as emphasized in theory by their leader. The obstacle lies in the large personal following Dr. Lohia has in the party, constituting his strenth and his party's near-fatal weakness.

CONCEPT OF TRUTH

Dr. Lohia once said: "A favourite phrase of my early youth was the concept that truth was a line at one end of which stood yes and at the other end no and the intervening space consisted of varying shades of yes and no". From early youth till now Dr. Lohia would appear to have been briskly traversing this imaginary line. No doubt this perplexing search for truth will

continue till the end of his life, making him adopt different postures at different times. Should he keep the SSP also travelling to and from an this line ? Or should he leave the party to pursue its ideals under the leadership of younger men, devoting himself totally to the endless pursuit of truth ? Either he or his followers should provide the answer. He surely will not, for he fancies himself at the centre of every storm and would like to be the Supreme Leader swallowing up everything that comes along, much in the way of quicksand. It would be a tragedy for the SSP and the left if the right answer is not found.

57

LOHIA : THE UNIQUE SOCIALIST

VERINDER GROVER*

Rammanohar Lohia ruled the hearts and minds of many, the records of recent times would bear sufficient testimony to that. He inspired many to act when the going was rough, to rally when the rout seemed total, to get back repeatedly to the path of struggle, suffering and sacrifice. He even made the humble and the lowly scale heights that until then were the exclusive preserve of the prigileged few. The question that arises—do the values he cherised still have a meaningful message ? And what about his philosophy of "jail, spade and vote" ? On the dictum of "Construction and Satyagraha. Moreover, in Lohia relevant in the present day India ?

But what was the exact philosophy of Dr. Lohia ? Was he a socialst philosopher ? Or a radical nationalist whose anger against injustice and yearning for an egalitarian way of life would not allow him to confine himself to any given label for long ? Or a visionary born ahead of his time ? Or was he a schemer whose only ambition was get to power and share it with none ?

It cannot be denied that Dr. Lohia was a socialist who firmly believed that socialism, if it were to lead the people to progress and prosperity must be based on the Indian conditions.

Socialism has the reputation of much interpreted and less

* Former Reader, Department of Political Science, and Managing Editor, *Indian Political Science Review*, University of Delhi, Delhi.

understood term. Even in India no two thinkers agree to what exactly socialism is. Many and varied have been the influence that have shaped socialist thought in India. In the earlier period of its evolution, socialism was more or less synonymous with orthodox Marxism, offering not merely a scientific account of the historical evolution of society but a guide to revolutionary action. In this period Gandhi was derided as a reactionary hampering the process of social transformation.

During the Second World War, however, a period of rethinking and self-analysis set in when some of the Gandhian principles were re-examined in the light of the communist and socialist movements all over the world as also in view of the special economic problems facing India. As a result, the socialist thought came to be infleunced by Gandhian views. Lohia was the one who tried to give a new orientation of Marxist and Gandhian principle. The Lohia was greatly infleunced by Gandhi, but he was not a slavish follower of the Mahatama. He wanted the implementation of the principles of decentralisation in all aspected but rejected the Gandhian concept that at the techincal level India's ills can be solved by the use of *Charkha.* He was in favour of innovative technology for fields as well as workshops. He admired the non-violent resistance forged by Gandhi and rejected armed revolution.

Speaking at the pachmarhi Session of the Socialist Party in 1952, Dr. Lohia very clearly pointed out the influences of Gandhi and Socialism in these words : "It is silly to be a Gandhian or Marxist and it is equal so to be anti-Gandhian on anti-marxist. There are priceless treasures to learn from Marx; but the learning can only be done when the frame of reference does not derive from an age or a person."[1] Lohia was of the view that some of the Marxist concepts like the "theory of evolution of capitalism" are inadequate. Communism though it destorys private property yet is fails to fulfil its economic aim—hence the Marxist thery is inadequate. Moreover, Lohia accepts the Marxist concept of class struggle as the dynamics of social change, but diffres from Marx on the premise that all human history is the history of class struggle.

Dr. Lohia wanted, like Marx, to give firm foundation to the theory of socialism by chalking out a programme of action for the realisation of the final goal. This can be done by bringing about

a comprehensive, seven-fold revolution through three instruments—Jail, spade and vote. According to Lohia, the choice for the socialists is not between the ballot and the bullet, between parliament and insurrection, as is generally believed: it is between "Satyagraha" and the "bullet". The ballot undoubtedly has its place but when injustice and opression assume unbearable proportions, the only course left open to justice-loving people is to take recourse to the matchless remedy of civil disobedience.

According to Lohia Asian socialism cannot be gradual; it will have to be drastic and unconstitutional, though peaceful. To achieve this type of socialism Lohia recommends "seven-fold" revolution consisting of procedural revolution, revolution against inequalities, revolt of the subject people all over the world against their unjust rulers, revolt of the poor against the rich, revolution aiming at protecting the privacy of the individual against encroachment by the collective State and the revolution against the indiscrimate use of war weapons. This Revolution, according to Lohia, must combine the twin principles of sympathy for all and anger against injustice.

In the evolution of the socialist movement and the elaboration of the socialist though in India, Dr. Rammanohar Lohia occupied a unique place. His contribution to the socialist movement was outstanding. He was the first socialist thinker in India who refused to have his mental horizon limited by the ideas drawn from the Soviet Union or from the West. His socialism was a product of the soil. He knew that the socialism of the text-books was beyond the comprehension of the common man in India, as he is shrouded in superstitions, obsolete customs, poerty and ignorance. Therefore, he sought to work out his ideas in consonance with these conditions. Dr. Lohia dreamt socialism in the form of a new socialist civilisation which would be free from all types of exploitation—social, political and economic.

Political philosophy has no meaning, if it does not take into consideration the people and their problems. Dr. Lohia took into consideration complex socio-economic problems of India and on these grounds enunciated his political ideas. Dr. Lohia can be distinguished from other political leaders for his dynamic and uninhibted approach to the various problems. Freedom in thought

and experimentation was that he cherished most. That is Lohia's most valuable gift to the socialists in India.

Note and Reference

1. "Economics After Marx" in *Marx and Socialism* (Hyderabad : Navhind Pub., 1963), p. 1.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

SECTION 'A'

Lohia's Works, Collection of Speeches, Articles and Letters
Lohia's Works and Collection of Speeches

Books in English

An Interval During Politics, Hyderabad, (Nav Hind Prakashan, 1965).

Fragments of World Mind, Calcutta, Maitrayani, 1965.

Guilty Men of India's Partition, Hyderabad, (Rammanohar Lohia Samta Vidyalaya Nyas, 1970).

India China and Northern Frontiers, Hyderabad (Nav Hind Prakashan, 1963).

Language, Hyderabad, Nav Hind Prakashan, 1966.

Marx, Gandhi and Socialism, Hyderabad, (Nav Hind Prakashan, 1963).

Rupees 25,000 A Day, Hyderabad, (Nav Hind Prakashan, 1963).

The Caste System, Hyderabad, (Nav Hind Parkashan, 1963).

The Mystery of Sir Stafford Cripps, Bombay, (Padma Publication, 1942.)

Wheel of History, Hyderabad, (Nav Hind Prakashan, Second Edition, 1963.)

Will to Power, Hyderabad, (Nav Hind Prakashan, 1956).

Note and Comments, Vol. I and II, Hyderabad, (Rammanohar Lohia Samta Vidhalaya Nyas, 1975).

Articles

'A Prophecy' (Tape of Athens Seminar, October 1961), *Mankind*,

February 1968.
'A Trustee with Jamnalalji', *Harijan*, April 26, 1942.
'An Independence Day Manifesto', *National Herald*, January 29, 1940.
'Anti-Imperialist Conference', *National Herald*, September 27, 1939.
'Capitalism Misses the Bus', *Congress Socialist*, Bombay, February 22, 1938.
'Congress Conception of India's Freedom', *National Herald*, March 15 and 16, 1940.
'Co-existence with Approximation' (Tape of Athens Seminar), *Mankind*, September 1968.
'Devaluation—A Note', *Mankind*, October 1966.
'Economic Disparities Among Nations' (Tape of Athens Seminar), *Mankind*, June 1968.
'Facts and Fallacies of Indian History', *Modern Review*, January 1939.
'Gandhi' (Tape of Athens Seminar), *Mankind*, October 1968.
'Girls in Conference', *National Herald*, January 29, 1940.
'How to Fight Imperialism' ? (Hindi) *Sangharsh*, Lucknow, June 25, 1939.
'I lost the A.I.C.C.', *National Herald*, February 23, 1940.
'Immediate Satyagraha', *Harijan*, June 1, 1940.
'Indian Agriculture in Figures', *National Herald*, January 20, 1940.
'Indian Foreign Policy' (Newspaper cutting in the file of A.I.C.C. Dr. Lohia's correspondence, 1938).
'Indian Armed Forces', *Mankind*, March 1966.
'Indian Freedom Front', *Modern Review*, October 1937.
'Indian Economy in Figures', *National Herald*, January 18, 1940.
'India's Public Health and Nutrition', *National Herald*, February 24, 1940.
'International Balance Sheet', *Congress Socialist*, Bombay, March 5, 1938.
'Is it Recovery ?', *Congress Socialist*, Bombay, February 1936.
'Mahatma Gandhi--A Tribute of No Importance', *National Herald*, October 15, 1939.
'Naxalbari, Asansol and Calcutta', *Mankind*, August 1967.
'Plea for a Budget without Foreign Aid', *Mankind*, July 1967.
'Presidential Election', *Mankind*, June 1976.
'Russia's Development', *Mankind*, November 1967.
'Russian Trials' (Hindi), *Sangharsh*, May 16, 1938.

'Socialist Self-Critism', *Congress Socialist*, Bombay, May 1936.
'Synthesis of Science and Spiritualism', *Janta*, December 13, 1953.
'The Collapse of International Morality', *Congress Socialist*, February 26, 1938.
'The Head of Assassin', *Mankind*, September 1966.
'The Joyous Revolution', *Mankind*, July, 1970.
'The Rise of Indian National Movement', *Congress Socialist*, December 1937.
'To Hell with Arms', *National Herald*, November 10, 1939.
'Treacherous Japan or Complacent Britain', *Harijan*, April 19, 1942.

Letters

Letter to Prof. Laski from Jail in 1945, *Mankind*, February 1968.
Letter to Party Workers, April 17, 1956, *Mankind*, August 1968.
Letters to Party Workers, February 25, March 31 and June 12, 1954, *Janta*, July 18, 1954.
Letter to Party Workers, June 23, 1956, *Mankind*, June 1968.
Letter to Party Workers, February 1960, *Mankind*, August 1970.
Letter to Party Workers (The Civil Disobedience Movement), 1960, *Mankind*, August 1970.
Letters to Gandiji, *Harijan*, June 1, 1940.
Letter to U.P. Jail Minister, 1957. The letter was published in a booklet entitled *Vashishtas and Valmiks*.
Letter to the President of India from Central Jail, Naini, July, 1954, *Mankind*, February-March 1970.
Letter to Ravia Somiah, *Mankind*, March 1970.
Open Letter to the Goans in 1946, *Mankind*, August 1969.

SECTION 'B'

Reports, Pamphlets and Compilations

A Dictionary of Non-Congressism, *Mankind*, January 1970.
All-India Congress Socialist Party, Constitution and Programme, Bombay, 1937.
Facts on Lohia's Attempt at Disrupting the P.S.P. (Delhi, Praja Socialist Publication, 1955).
Faizpur Policy Statement of the Congress Socialist Party, 1936.
Lok Sabha Debates.
Lok Sabha Mein Lohia (Hindi), Calcutta (Janmukh Prakashan).

Vol. I (August 13, 1963 to September 20, 1963)
Vol. II (November 4, 1963 to December 1963)
Vol. III (January 11, 1964 to April 15, 1964)

Lohia's Separate Note to Interim Report of the Government of India's Foodgrain Policy Committee of 1948, *Mankind*, June, 1968.

Nehru-Jayaprakash Narayan Talks, Bombay, Praja Socialist Publication, 1953).

Policy Statement of the Praja Socialist Party, Bombay, 1954.

Principles of Revolutionary Organization, *Mankind*, May 1969.

Proceedings of the Nagpur Special Convention of the P.S.P.. *Janta*, December 5, 1954.

Proceedings of the Meeting of the N.E. at Bharatpur, Chaukhamba, (Hindi), Indore, January 1963.

Programme and Policy of the Congress Socialist Party, Bombay, 1934.

Report of the All-India Congress Socialist Party, Third Annual Conference, Bombay, 1937.

Report of the Sixth Annual Conference of the Socialist Party, Bombay, 1948.

Report of the Seventh Annual Conference of the Socialist Party, Poona, 1949.

Report of the Eighth Conference of the Socialist Party, Bombay, 1950.

Report of the Pachmarhi Special Convention of the Socialist Party, Bombay, 1952.

Report of the Special Convention of the Praja Socialist Party, Bombay, 1953.

Socialist Unification in India, *Mankind*, October, 1957.

Socialist Unity—Another Attempt Fails, Delhi, (Praja Socialist Publication, 1963).

Statement as his own Witness in the Times Magazine Case, in Delhi, September 7, 1966, *Mankind*, November 1968.

Statement of the Policy of the Congress Socialist Party, Meerut, 1936.

The Merger—How and Why ? Delhi, Praja Socialist Publication, Bombay, 1952).

The Merger Annulled Delhi, (Praja Socialist Publication, 1965)

Two Years of P.S.P., Delhi (Praja Socialist Publication, 1954).

Warning at Sherghati, Delhi, 1958.

We Build for Socialism, Bombay, 1951.

SECTION 'C'

Reference Books

Appadorai, A., *Indian Political Thinking from Naroji to Nehru*, Madras, (Oxford University Press, 1971).

———, *Essays in Politics and International Relations*, Bombay, (Asia Publishing House, 1969).

Barnett, *Communist China and Asia*, (London, 1960).

Brecher, *Michael, Nehru—A Political Biography*, London, (Oxford University Press, 1969).

Coker, W. Frances, *Recent Political Thought*, Calcutta, (The World Press Private Ltd., 1966.)

Chopra, Pran, *Uncertain India*, Bombay, (Asia Publishing House, 1968).

Desai, A.R., *Recent Trends in Nationalism*, Bombay, (Popular Book Depot, 1960).

Deva, Acharya Narendra, *Socialism and the National Revolution*, Bombay, (Padma Publication, 1946).

———, *Rashtriyata Aur Samajbad*, (Hindi) (Banaras, 1950).

Dutt, R. Palme, *India—To-day and Tomorrow*, (Delhi, People's Publishing House, 1955.)

Ghurye, G.S., *Caste and Race in India*, (Bombay, Popular Prakashan, Fifth Edition, 1969).

Gray, Alexander, *The Socialist Tradition*, (London, Longmans 1963).

Gupta, R.C., "The Changing Phase of the Socialist Party in India —A Critique'. The article was published in the book *Indian Political Parties, Programmes, Promises and Performances*, Delhi, (The Institute of the Constitution and Parliamentary Studies, 1971).

Hartmann, Horst, *Political Parties in India*, (Meerut, Meenakshi Prakashan, 1971).

Jones, W.H. Morris, *The Government and Politics in India*, (London, 1954).

Kabir, Humayun, *The Indian H'ritage*, Third Edition, (Bombay, 1962).

Kelkar, Indumati, Lohia—*Sidhant Aur Karm* (Hindi), (Hyderabad,

Nav Hind Prakashan, 1963).

Kirplani, J.B., *Gandhian Thought*, (Calcutta, Orient Longmans, 1961).

Lall, Prof. Mukut Behari, Acharya Narendra Dev—*Yug Aur Netratav* (Hindi), (Varanasi, 1971).

Lenin, V.I. *Collected Works*, Moscow.

Limaye, Madhu, *Evolution of the Socialist Party*, (Hyderabad, Chetan Publication, 1952).

Mankekar, D.R., *The Guilty Men of 1962*, Bombay, (Tulsi Shah Enterprises, 1968).

Mashruwala, K.G , *Gandhian Vichar Dohan* (Hindi), (Sasta Sahitaya Mandal, Fifth Edition, 1951).

Marx-Engels, *Selected Works*, Vol. I, (Moscow, 1962).

Mehta, Asoka, *Politics of Planned Economy*, (Bombay, 1953).

Merriam, Charles Edward, *A History of American Political Theories*, (New York, 1926).

Mitra, N.N., *Indian Annual Registrar*, (Calcutta, Vols. I and II, 1936; Vol. I; 1938 ; Vol; I, 1947).

Moraes, Frank, *The Revolt in Tibet* (Jullunder, Sterling Publishers, 1966).

Mukherjee Hiren, *Gandhi—A Study*, (Delhi, People's Publishing House, 1960).

Murty, K. Satchidananda, *Indian Foreign Policy*, (Calcutta, Scientific Book Agency, 1964).

Narayan, J.P., '*Why Socialism* ?' (Banaras, All-India Congress Socialist Party, 1936).

————, *Towards Struggle*, (Bombay, 1946).

Namboodripad, E.M S., *The Mahatma and the Ism*, (Delhi, People's Publishing House, 1959).

Nehru, Jawaharlal, *Jawaharlal Nehru's Speeches*, Vol. I, 2nd Edition, (Delhi, The Publication Division, 1957).

Pal, Lakhan, *History of the Congress Socialist Party*, (Lahore, National Publishers and Stationers, 1946).

Prasad Rajendra, *At the Feet of Mahatma Gandhi*, (Bombay, Hind Kitabas, 1961).

Sampurnanand Memories and Reflections, (Bombay, Asia Publishing House, 1960).

Santhanan, K., *Satyagraha and the State*, (Bombay, Asia Publishing House, 1960).

Sarad, Onkar, *Lohia* (Hindi), (Lucknow, Prakashan Kendra, 1972).

Shah, Jagdish, *Socialist Paralysed*, (Amritsar, 1956).

Singh, H.K , *A History of the P.S.P.* (1934-59), (Lucknow, 1959).

Tendulkar, D.G., *Mahatma*, Vols. VII and VIII, (New Delhi, Government of India, Ministry of Information and Broadcasting, The Publication Division).

Thorner, Daniel, *The Agrarian Prospects in India*, (1956).

Varma, Dr. V.P., *Political Philosophy*, Agra, (Laxmi Narayan Agarwal, 1970).

Weiner, Myron, *The Politics of Scarcity*, (Bombay, Asia Publishing House, 1963).

Weiner, Myron, *Party Politics in India*, (London, 1957).

Wofford, Jr. Harris. *Lohia and America Meet*, (Madras, Snehlata Rana Reddy, 1961).

Articles

Gandhi, Mahatma, 'Satyagraha Not Yet', *Harijan*, June 1, 1940.

Kirplani, J.B., 'Gandhi and Lohia', *Janta*, December 12, 1965.

Limaye, Madhu, 'The Problem of Socialist Unity in India', *Mankind*, October, 1958.

Sinha, Tarkeshwari, 'Lohia in Parliament', *Mankind*, June-July, 1969.

Wofford, Jr. Harris, 'Gandhian Socialism and The Third Camp', *Mankind*, August-September, 1961.

SECTION 'D'

Periodicals and Newspapers

English

1. Congress Socialist, Calcutta and Bombay.
2. Harijan, Poona and Ahmedabad.
3. *Janta*, Bombay and Delhi.
4. *Mankind* Hyderabad and Delhi.
5. Modern Review, Calcutta.
6. *Indian Express*, Delhi.
7. *Indian Nation*, Patna.
8. *Hindu*, Madras.
9. *Hindustan Standard*, Calcutta.
10. *Hindustan Times*, Delhi.
11. *Leader*, Allahabad.

12. *National Herald*, Lucknow.
13. *Pioneer*, Lucknow.
14. *Patriot*, Delhi.
15. *Times of India*, Delhi.
16. *Tribune*, Ambala.

Hindi

1. *Sangharsh*, Lucknow.
2. *Jan*, Calcutta and Delhi.
3. *Chaukhamba*, Indore.

INDEX

Abyssinian War, 6, 538
Adam Smith, 180, 398
Again, without Lohia, 554
Agencies, 489
Aims, 482
All-India Charkha Association, 417
All-India Congress Committee, 419
All-India Village Industries Association, 417
Ambedkar, B.R., 548
Analysis of British Intention, 78
Andaman Day, 538
Anecdotes about Mahatma Gandhi, 413
Anger Unbound, 553
Angrezi Hatao Andolan, 645
Army is Empire, 83
Asian Complacency, 582
Asian Policy, 664
Asiatic Amendment Act, 127
Aspect of Distribution, 233
Atlantic-Soviet Struggle, 522
Attempt to Kill, 388
Azad, Maulana, 64

Bajaj, Jamnalal, 416
Balkanisation of India, 74
Beauty and Skin Colour, 285
Bhodan Movement, 516
Bill of Rights of the Federal Constitution, 19
Blind Spot in his Make-up, 549
Bolshevik Revolution, 511
Borrowed Breath, 590
Bose, Subhash Chandra, 389, 459, 540
British Declaration, 71
British Hratt, 74-76
British Guiana, 132

Cape Town Agreement, 129
Charlie Chaplin, 415
Chatterji, Bankin Chandra, 459
Churchill, 66, 69, 400
Civil Disobedience Movement in South Africa, 110
Civil Disobedience Movement, 1960 Lohia's Letter to Party Members, 482
Clear Declaration, 576
Civil Liberties in America, 14
Civil Liberties in England, 23
Civil Liberties in India, 38
Civil Liberties in France, 9
Civil Liberties Union, 18-19
Concept of Civil Liberties, 30
Communist Party, 415
Compromise of Views, 580
Concept of Truth, 673
Congress Committee Resolution, 381
Congress Socialist Party, 380, 416, 610
Cripp's India Mission, 69-70
Criminal Law Amendment Act, 39
Cripp's Somersaults in India, 64
Cripps, Stafford, 71, 426

Dandavate, Madhu, 584
Das, Parimal Kumar, 537

Dave, Rohit, 571
Declaration of Slavery, 86
Deepak, Om Parkash, 511
Defence of India, 81
Desai, Morarji, 617
Deva, Acharya Narendra, 322
Development of Lohia's Thoughts, 511
Dignity of Man, 572
Disaffection Act of 1934, 26
Disfranchisement Act, 127
Doctrinal Foundation of Socialism, 141
Doctrinal Insanity, 558
Drama of State Action, 87
Dr. Lohia : Angrezi Hatao, 544
Duncan Case, 26

Efforts bear Fruit, 579
Engels, 188
England's Necessity to Maintain the Empire, 68
Equality and Beyond, 591
Equality and Prosperity, 473
Faith of Our Time, 560
Fight Against Casteism, 573
Final Split, 582
First Lahore Conspiracy Case, 44
Five Imperialisms, 309
Foreign Policy : Dr. Lohia's Thought, 641
Foreign Policy, 262
Forms, 483
Four-Pillar State, 314-15
Franklin, Benjamin, 14
French Military Scandal, 15
French-Revolution, 540
Future Freedom Assured, 72

Candhi's Blemish, 440
Gandhi, Lohia and Gandhism, 561
Gandhi, Mahatma, 48, 60, 170, 180, 342, 370, 413
General, 117
Gokhale, G.K., 413
Gold Law, 127

Great Britain, 338
Grover, Verinder, 675
Guru Nanak, 296

Henry Ford, 619
Hidden Imperialisms, 277
Himalayan Policy, 665
Hind Mazdoor Panchayat, 546
Hind Kisan Panchayat, 161, 512
Hind Mazdoor Sabha, 161
Hindi—Here and Now, 384
Hindu-Muslim Conflict, 303
Hindu Muslim Riots, 494
Hinduism, 302
Hindu Versus Hindu, 292
Hitler, 87
Human Socialism of Dr. Lohia, 571
Hussain, Zakir, 406, 410

Ilbert Bill, 38
Implementation, 391
Imperialist New Economic Policy, 133
India and the Third Camp, 664
Indian Crew in China and Japan, 138
India on China, 89, 543
Indian Political Conference in London, 139, 542
Indian States, 75
India—Weakness and Strength, 230
India's Armed Forces, 351
Indians in Foreign Lands, 111, 543
India's Path to Socialism, 228
India's Stand, 542
Indo-Pakistani Relations, 666
Is it Recovery ?, 3
Is There Realty or Mystery ?, 65

Japan wants China, 99
Jinnah, 374, 440
Johnson, Charles, 525
Junior, Harris Wofforo, 521
Jr., Harris Wofford, 648
Juristic, not Real Freedom, 73

Kamath, H.V., 548

Karl Marx, 188, 199, 398
Kennedy, 344
Kennedy, Robert, 648
Kenya and British East Africa, 125
Khan Abdul Gaffar Khan, 43, 372, 515
Kisan Panchayat, 25-27 324,
Koirala, 93, 482
Korean War, 506
Kropotkin, 180

Language Act, 394
Language's Growth, 392
Laski, Harold, 515
Last Testament, 558
Lenin, 188, 458
Lohia's Address at the Fisk University Negro School in the South, 521
Lohia—An American Radical's Estimate, 612
Lohia and Asian Socialism, 576
Lohia and Gandhiji's Legacy, 596
Lohia and the Indian Youth, 551
Lohia and the Origins of Indian Foreign Policy, 519
Lohia's Concept of the "Third Camp", 663
Lohia's Foreign Policy Attitudes, 661
Lohia's Ideas on Indian Economic Development, 604
Lohia in the Lok Sabha, 548
Lohia, Rammanohar, 3, 6, 9, 89, 111 141, 180, 205, 210, 228, 244, 262, 268, 283, 292, 305, 315, 335, 341, 351, 381, 384, 396, 405, 413, 440, 445, 462, 464, 473, 534
Lohia : The Unique Socialist, 675
Lohia's Quest for a new Dimension, 584
Lohia : Quicksand Revolutionary, 668
Lincoln, Abraham, 14
Luck in Russia, 63

Maksud, Clovis, 534
Malice to None, 574
Man his final Measure, 609
Martin Luther King, 648
Marx and Lohia : The Socialist Path, 556
Marx, Gandhi and Lohia, 589
Marxism and Socialism, 180
McMohan, Ian, 612
Meaning of Equality, 244
Medical Associations of the Country, 379
My Restlessness and the Reasons For it, 381
Mystery of Rammanohar Lohia, 630
Mystery of Sir Stafford Cripps, 62

Narayan, Jaya Prakash, 399, 432
Naxalbari, 446-49
Naxalbari, Asansol and Calcutta, 445
Nehru, Pandit Jawaharlal, 451, 519
Non-Congressism and the Strategy of Revolution, 537
Non-co-operation, 414
Not the same Fate, 588

Obsessive Desire for Change, 611
Official Language Act, 544
Old Testament, 531
On Inequality of Sexes, Single Woman and Widow, 282
One Gets so Lonely, 648
Organisation, 328

Palestine Day, 538
Panchayat Raj, 601
Patel, Sardar, 507
Philosophy of Despair, 305
Planlessness, 320
Plan to End Poverty, 324
Plea for a Budget without Foreign Aid, 464
Praja Socialist Party, 498, 610
Pravada, 5
Preferential Opportunity, 587
Premier Dreams, 66
Presidential Election, 405

Pretexts for the Policy, 77
Programme of Action, 592

Quit India, 512

Rajagopalachari, 67
Rammanohar Lohia—The man of Upright Life, 608
Rangoon Conference, 581
Rigveda, 289
Roosevelt, 526
Rowlatt Act, 38, 39
Roy, Raja Rammohan, 597
Russia's Developments, 396

Samyukta Socialist Party, 610
Satyagraha, 163-64, 312
Search for Identity, 586
Seceding Provinces, 76
Second Round Table Conference, 415
Second World War, 540
Seven Revolutions and Five Hidden Imperialisms, 269
Shaping the Policy, 578
Shastri, Lal Bahadur, 617
Shri Dange, 68, 464
Sino-Indian Relations and Defence, 666
Sino-Japanese War, 89
China is Semi-Colonial, 89
Chinese Government Political Parties, 90
Japan's Urge to Imperialist Expansion, 91
Conflict on North China, 92
New Government in Japan, 91
Sino-Russian Conflict, 343
Socialism—A Definition, 228
Socialist Commitment, 547
Socialist Party, 173, 178, 213, 330, 610
Socialist Self-Criticism, 205
Some Selected Questions and Answers,
Source of Strength and Weakness, 610
South Africa, 127
Spontaneous Response, 551
Spread of Hindi, 385
Spreading of Truth, 545
Stanfford, 64, 67
Stafford's Socialism, 62
Stalin, 148, 188, 196, 394, 512, 522, 619
Statement of Principles, 210
State of Secrecy, 546
Struggle for Civil Liberties, 9
Sun Yat Sen, 104

Taft—Hartley anti-labout Bill, 530,
Tagore, Rabindranath, 43, 459
Tanganyika and Mauritus, 122
Theory of Immediacy, 584
Theory of Supremacy, 557
Therefore Appeasement, 70
Those Who Stall, 386
Time Table, 487
Toofan, Brij Mohan, 551
Tradition, 390
Trotsky, 188

United States Citizenship, 137
Unity of China, 104

Values he Cherished, 609
Vajpayee, Atal Behari, 464
Variety, 387
Violence and Non-Violence, 594
Viveka Nanda, 459

What of the President, 80
Where the Mind is without Fear, 341
Why did Churchill Send Him, 68
Why no Immediate Transfer of Power ?, 85
Why then did he Come to India, 67
Without Lohia, 656

Zamindari Abolition Fund, 319
Zanzibar, 118
Zanzibar Clove Bill, 120